STUDIES IN CEREMONIAL

VERNON STALEY

Diocese of Aberdeen
and Orkney.

CHRISTIE MEMORIAL
LIBRARY.

D1.15

No. 185

A.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_KU-996-156

STUDIES IN CEREMONIAL.

STUDIES
IN
CEREMONIAL

ESSAYS ILLUSTRATIVE
OF
ENGLISH CEREMONIAL

By the Rev. VERNON STALEY,
AUTHOR OF
"The Ceremonial of the English Church," etc.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO.
Oxford: 106, S. Aldate's Street;
London: 64 & 65, Farringdon Street, E.C.
(All rights reserved.)
1901.

PREFACE.

IN a former work, *The Ceremonial of the English Church*, (A. R. Mowbray & Co., Oxford,) allusion is made, with disapproval, to certain ornaments and ceremonies which, within the last fifty years or so, seem to have been introduced without adequate authority into many English churches. These questionable things have unfortunately come to be regarded in certain quarters with approval. On this account, I have felt it desirable to investigate fully, scientifically, and historically, the matters in question. The results of such investigation, which tend to confirm the disapproval expressed in my earlier work, are placed before the reader in the following pages. An exception to this line will be found in the articles entitled, "Bowing at the Name of Jesus," and "Bowing towards the Altar." These articles are included in the present work, because of the widespread neglect which prevails in regard to these particular practices, in the face of their authorization by the English Church.

My thanks are due to Dr. J. Wickham Legg, and Mr. F. C. Eeles, for considerable help in preparing this work for the press.

This volume is sent forth in the hope, that it may be of some service in promoting uniformity of ceremonial, based upon true English principles, and in accordance with the authority of the English Church in this matter.

V. S.

SOUTH ASCOT,
June 1, 1901.

LIST OF WORKS REFERRED TO AND QUOTED.

Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, Lond., 1893.

Alfonsi Salmeronis Toletani e Soc. Jesu Theologi, *Commentarii*, Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1604.

Alcuin, *De Divinis Officiis*, Bibl. Patr. Auct.

Amalarius, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, in Hittorpius.

Ancren Riwle, Camden Society, 1852.

Andrewes, *Works*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford.

Archæologia, Vols. xxvi., xli., xliii., l., lii., quarto, Nichols and Sons.

Aungier, *History and Antiquities of Syon Monastery*, Lond., 1840.

Barclay, *A Persuasive to the People of Scotland . . .*, 2nd ed. Lond., 1723.

Becon, *The Displaying of the Popish Mass*, Works, Vol. iii. Parker Society.

Bede, *De Temporum Ratione*, Works, 12 Vols, Lond., 1843.

Belethus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, folio, Migne, Patrologiæ, tom. ccii.

Bishop, Edmund, *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, Weekly Register Office, 1899.

Bisse, *The Beauty of Holiness*, 7th ed. Lond., 1720.

Bona, *Rerum Liturgicarum*, Omnia Opera, folio, Antwerp, 1739.

Bramhall, *Works*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford.

Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, 3 Vols, Bohn, 1849.

Bridgett, *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, 2 Vols, Lond., 1881.

Bristol and Gloucestershire Archæological Society's Transactions, Vol. xv.
British Magazine, Vols. viii., xii., xix., xxxiii.
Brun, Pierre Le, *Explication de la Messe*, 4 Vols, Liege, 1777.
Buckinghamshire, Records of, Vol. viii. Aylesbury, 1899.
Burchardt, *Ordo Missæ*, in Cochleus, Venice, 1572.

Cæremoniale Episcoporum, folio, Paris, 1633.
Canons of the First Four Councils. Oxford, 1867.
Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, 2 Vols, Oxford, 1844.
,, *History of Conferences*. Oxford, 1840.
,, *Synodalia*, 2 Vols, Oxford, 1842.
Cartusiense, Ordinarium, Paris, 1582.
Cartusiani, Missale, Fauratii in Sabaudia, folio, 1679.
Cartularium Ecclesiæ Sancti Nicholai Aberdonensis, New Spalding Club, Aberdeen, 1888.
Catalani, Commentary on *Sacrarum Cæremoniarum sive Rituum Ecclesiasticorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Libri tres*, 2 Vols, folio, Rome, 1750.
,, Commentary on *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, 2 Vols, quarto, Paris, 1860.
Catholic Customs, A Guide for the Laity, Catholic Truth Society.
Ceremoniale Parisiense, 1703.
Challoner, *The Garden of the Soul*, Lond., 1798.
Chambers, *Divine Worship in England in the 13th and 14th Centuries*, Lond., 1877.
Clutterbuck, *A Plain and Rational Vindication and Explanation of the Liturgy of the Church of England . . .*, 3rd ed. Lond., 1702.
Cochleus, *Speculum Missæ*, Venice, 1572.
Collier, *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, 2 Vols, folio, Lond., 1708.
Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentaria in Omnes Divi Pauli Epistolas*, folio, Antwerp, 1665.
Corsetti, *Praxis Sacrorum Rituum ac Cæremoniarum*, Venice, 1739.
Cosin, *Works*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford.

Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, Smith and Cheetham, 2 Vols, Lond., 1875.
Dictionary of Christian Biography, Smith and Wace, 4 Vols, Lond., 1877.
Dictionary of National Biography, Leslie Stephens, 1885.
Dictionnaire des Cérémonies, Boissonnet, 3 Vols, Paris, 1847.
Dominican, *Cæremoniale juxta Ritum S. Ordinis Prædicatorum*, Mechlin, 1869.
Ducange, *Lexicon Manuale ad Scriptores Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis*, Migne, 1866.
Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 2nd ed. Paris, 1898.
Dugdale, *History of St. Paul's Cathedral*, folio, Lond., 1658.
Durandus, Gulielmus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Lyons, per Jacobum Sacon, 1510.
Durantus, J. S., *De Ritibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1592.

Eeles, *Reservation of the Holy Eucharist in the Scottish Church*, Aberdeen, 1889.
Exposition de la Messe, ed. Frere, Alcuin Club Collections, ii.

Falise, *Cérémonial Romain*, Paris, 1861.
,, *Sacrorum Rituum Elucidatio*, 1863.
First Prayer Book of Edward VI., British Museum.
Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, I., Cambridge University Press, 1898.
Fulke, *Answers*, Parker Society.

Gardellini, *Decreta Authentica Congregationis Sacrorum Rituum*, 4 Vols, Rome, 1856.
Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward vi. and The Book of Common Prayer*, Lond., 1890.
Gibson, *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, 2nd ed. 2 Vols, folio, Oxford, 1761.
Grindal, *Remains*, Parker Society.

Hampson, *Medii Ævi Kalendarium*, 2 Vols, Lond.
Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, folio, Dublin, 1719.
,, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, 2 Vols, Ecclesiastical History Society, 1849.
Hierurgia Anglicana, Lond., 1848.
Hittorpius, *De Divinis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Officiis*, folio, Paris, 1610.
Honorius Augustodunensis, *Gemma Animæ*, in Hittorpius.
Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 7th ed. 3 vols, Oxford, 1888.
Hooper, *Later Writings*, Parker Society.
Hospinianus, *Historiæ Sacramentariæ*, folio, Geneva, 1581.
Hugonis de Sancto Victore, *Speculum de Mysteriis Ecclesiæ*, in Hittorpius.

Illustrations of the Topography and Antiquities of the shires of Aberdeen and Banff, Aberdeen, Spalding Club, 1842.
Innocent iii., *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*.
Irish Ecclesiastical Record, August, 1892.

Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. ii. No. 7, April, 1901.

Keble, *Eucharistical Adoration*, 3rd ed. Oxford, 1867.
Keeling, *Liturgiæ Britannicæ*, 2nd ed. London, 1851.

Labbe-Cossart, *Concilia*, 1729.
Lathbury, *History of Convocation*, 2nd ed. Lond., 1853.
,, *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, 2nd ed. Oxford, 1859.
Laud, *Works*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Oxford.
Lay Folks Mass Book, Early English Text Society, 1879.
Legenda Aurea, 7 Vols, ed. Ellis, Dent, 1900.
Lincoln's Case, The Bishop of, Roscoe, Lond., 1891.

Lincoln Cathedral, Statutes of, H. Bradshaw and Chr. Wordsworth, 3 Vols, Cambridge University Press.
Lindewode, *Provinciale seu Constitutiones Angliæ*, folio, Oxford, 1679.
Liturgica Sacra Catholica, Carolus Kosma de Papi, Ratisbon, 1863.
Lydgate, *Virtue of the Mass*, Harl. MS., 2251.

Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, 2 Vols, Paris, 1687.
Mant, *On the Book of Common Prayer*, 2nd ed. Oxford, 1822.
Marcellus, Christopher, *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum sive Sacrarum Cerimoniarum SS. Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Libri tres*, folio, Venice, 1516.
,, *Sacrarum Cæremoniarum . . .*, Venice, 1573.
Mayer, *Explicatio Cæremoniarum Ecclesiasticarum*, Tugii, 1737.
Mediæval Ceremonial, The Church Quarterly Review, January, 1900, Vol. xlix.
Micklethwaite, *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, Alcuin Club Tracts, i. 1897.
Micrologus, *De Ecclesiasticis Observationibus*, in Hittorpius.
Missale Cartusiani, Fauratii in Sabaudia, folio, 1679.
Missale ad usum Percelebris Ecclesiæ Herfordensis, ed. Henderson, 1874.
Missæ Gothicæ et Officii Muzarabici, Toleti, 1875.
Missale Romanum, 1474, Henry Bradshaw Society, 1899.
,, ,, folio, Juntas, Venice, 1580.
,, ,, folio, Pauli Balleonii, Venice, 1713.
Missale Romano-Lugdunense, 1868.
Missale ad usum Insignis et Præclaræ Ecclesiæ Sarum, Burntisland, 1861-83.
Missale ad usum Insignis Ecclesiæ Eboracensis, 2 Vols, Surtees Society, 1874.
Moleon, De, *Voyages Liturgiques*, Paris, 1718.
Month, The, May, 1896; October, 1897.
Myrc, John, *Instructions to Parish Priests*, Early English Text Society, 1868.
Myroure of oure Ladye, Early English Text Society, 1873.

Neal, Daniel, *History of the Puritans*, 5 Vols, Lond., 1822.
Neale and Webb, *Symbolism of Churches . . .* a translation of the 1st book of Durandus' *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Leeds, 1843.
Nichols, J., *Illustrations of the Manners and Expences of Antient Times in England*, Lond., 1797.
Nicholls, W., *A Comment on the Book of Common Prayer*, folio, 2nd ed. Oxford, 1710.

Ordinarium Cartusiense, Paris, 1582.
Ordines Romani, in Mabillon's *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. Paris, 1689.

Paris de Crassus, *De Cæremoniis Cardinalium et Episcoporum in eorum diœcesibus*, Venice, 1582.
Peacock, *English Church Furniture*, Lond., 1866.
Pelliccia, *The Polity of the Christian Church*, trans. Bellett, Masters, 1883.
Pilkington, *Works*, Parker Society.
Polydore Vergil, *De Inventoribus Rerum*.
Promptorium Parvulorum, Camden Society, 1843.
Prynne, *Canterbury's Doom*, folio, Lond., 1646.
Pugin, *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament*, Lond., 1868.
Pontificale secundum ritum sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Lyons, 1542.

Quarti, *Rubricæ Missalis Romani, Commentariis illustratæ*, Venice, 1757.

Rites of Durham, Surtees Society, 1842.
Rock, *The Church of our Fathers*, 4 Vols, Dolman.
Robertson, *How shall we conform to the Liturgy?* 3rd ed. Murray, 1869.
Royal Commission on Ritual, Second Report, Lond., 1868.
Rufinus, in *De Fide et Symbolo*, ed. Heurtley, Oxford, 1884.
Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De Divinis Officiis*, in Hittorpius.

Scotland, The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in, Edin., 1844.
Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book, ed. J. W. Legg, Rivingtons, 1899.
Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, 2nd ed. 1876.
Shepherd, *A critical and practical elucidation of the Book of Common Prayer*, 4th ed. Lond., 1828.
Strasbourg, *Manuale seu Compendium Ritualis Argentinensis . . .*, 2nd ed. Argentinæ, 1780.
Strype, *Works*, 24 Vols, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Taverner, *Postils on the Epistles and Gospels*, ed. Cardwell, Oxford, 1841.
Taylor, Jeremy, *Works*, 10 Vols, ed. Eden, Lond., 1847.
Transactions of St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society, 4 Vols, Alabaster, Passmore. Harrison and Sons.

Vavasseur, Le, *Cérémonial selon le Rit Romain d'après Baldeschi*, Paris, 1871.
Visitation of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral, Camden Society, 1895.

Walcott, *History of the Parish Church of St. Margaret, Westminster*, 1847.
,, *Sacred Archæology*, Lond., 1868.
Walker, *Sufferings of the Clergy*, folio, Lond., 1714.
Whitgift, *Works*, Parker Society.
Wilkins, *Concilia*, 4 Vols, Lond., 1737.
Wordsworth, *Notes on Mediæval Services in England*, Lond., 1898.
Wren, *Parentalia*, folio, Lond., 1750.

Zurich Letters, Parker Society.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

I. Genuflections at the Consecration of the Eucharist - - - - - - - - - 1

II. Signing with the Cross at the Creeds - - 27

III. The Position of the Reader of the Liturgical Epistle - - - - - - - - - 51

IV. The Posture of the Hearers of the Liturgical Epistle - - - - - - - - - 75

V. Bowing at the Name of Jesus - - - - - 99

VI. Bowing towards the Altar - - - - - 127

VII. The Altar-Frontal - - - - - - - 145

VIII. The Altar-Lights - - - - - - - 169

IX. The Silken Chalice-Veil - - - - - - 195

X. The Chalice-Pall - - - - - - - 215

XI. The Biretta - - - - - - - - - 227

Genuflections at the Consecration of the Eucharist.

Pre-Reformation English ceremonial not identical with that of the modern Roman Church, pp. 3, 4. Genuflection during the canon a case in point, p. 5; never authorised by any rubric of the English Church, pp. 5, 6; an accompaniment of the elevation of the Host, p. 6. The elevation forbidden in 1549, and not since authorised, p. 7. Genuflection in the Roman Church, p. 8; not ordered in the Roman missal before the year 1570, p. 9; and not even a medieval ceremony, p. 10. Evidence from the pre-Pian missals negative, pp. 11, 12; Inclinations during the canon ordered, ibid., specially at *Supplices te rogamus*, and signification, pp. 13—15. Possible explanation of late date of direction to genuflect, pp. 15, 16. Extension of the practice in the Roman Church, pp. 16, 17. Testimony of English missals, pp. 17—19. Omission of directions in early English missals for external acts of adoration after consecration, pp. 19, 20. Conclusion, p. 21. Laity free to practise such gestures "as every man's devotion serveth," ibid. Practice of the Oriental Church, pp. 21—23. Inclination during the canon a Catholic custom, p. 24. *Note* on the practice of the Carthusian monks, p. 25.

I.

GENUFLECTIONS AT THE CONSECRATION OF THE EUCHARIST.

IT has been sometimes assumed in late years, that the ceremonial usages of the modern Roman Church are practically identical with those which prevailed abroad and in England before the Reformation. And, as a consequence of this assumption, it has been held by some, that, in order to discover what were the ceremonial usages of the English Church up to the close of the second year of King Edward the Sixth, the simplest plan is to visit the continental churches, or the nearest Roman Catholic chapel at home, and see for oneself. It would be difficult, as we hope to show, to commit oneself to a greater blunder than that which is involved in the foregoing statements. In the first place, the assumption that the existing Roman customs are identical with those which prevailed at home and abroad up to the close of the middle ages (which, we may say, was the beginning of the Reformation age), is demonstrably false. It is an assumption, the acceptance of which, in regard to ceremonial, has led to most

disastrous results in the English Church during the last half century.

Father Herbert Thurston, writing in *The Month*, Oct. 1897, pages 394, ff., says—"Few Catholics would probably be able to distinguish between what is ancient and what is modern, in the actions which they see every day performed by the priest at the altar. Few probably are aware how recent, comparatively speaking, are many of those rites which seem to them part of the very nature of things. . . . The observances which now prevail so uniformly throughout the Roman obedience were only introduced shortly before the Reformation; and several of the external rites, which we regard as amongst the most appropriate of the ceremonies of the Mass, would probably have seemed strange and outlandish in the eyes of St. Dunstan, St. Thomas Aquinas, or even Blessed John Fisher." Here Father Thurston, whose learning and patient investigation compel a tribute of admiration, bears testimony to the fact, that it is the height of folly to assert that the modern ceremonial usages of the Roman Church are identical with those of the middle ages up to the eve of the Reformation. This being so, what can be said of the many usages which have been intruded upon the English Church in recent years, on the ground that the medieval and modern Roman customs are identical? We read somewhere of the catas-

trophe which befell a house built upon a foundation of sand: the foundation was unequal to the superstructure, and the house fell to pieces.

As an illustration of the danger of trusting to such a fallacious assumption as that referred to, let us examine the custom of genuflection during the Canon of the Eucharist. The practice of the celebrant genuflecting after the consecration of the elements has been widely introduced into our churches. It has, in fact, come to be regarded in certain quarters as a custom of the very first importance. To omit the genuflections, is regarded by certain people as implying disbelief in the Sacramental Presence, and is considered to be sufficient to render the offender liable to forfeit any claim to be regarded as a Catholic. Now, what are the facts of the case, as seen from an historical point of view? They are as follows:

I.

As far as we have been able to ascertain, genuflection by the celebrant during the Canon has never been authorised by any rubric of the Liturgies of the Church in England, from the introduction of Christianity until the present time.[1] In other words, no Missal used in the English Church has yet been discovered, in

1 "No printed English Missal has any rubric directing genuflection at or after the Consecration."—*Mediæval Ceremonial*, The Church Quarterly Review, January, 1900, Vol. xlix. p. 410.

which the celebrant is directed to genuflect during the Canon. We do not say that genuflection was not practised by individuals in the sixteenth century in England, but when it was so practised, it was in disregard of the rubrics of the Missals, which omitted to prescribe it, or which gave other directions. Thus, genuflection during the Canon in England has never been explicitly sanctioned: it remains unsanctioned to-day. The unauthorised genuflections introduced in some places during the sixteenth century were associated with the elevation of the Host. All the evidence goes to show that genuflection is one of those ceremonies which arose as a custom after, and consequent on, the introduction of the elevation of the Host in the twelfth century in the West. Mr. Edmund Bishop, the learned Roman liturgiologist, says, "We do not realise at once how much of added and imposing ceremonial is involved in the addition, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of the single act of the elevation of the Host and Chalice, with its accompanying lights and torches, censings, bell-ringings, and genuflections."[1] On Mr. Bishop's admission, the elevation radically changed the character of the Mass: it was no part of the original primitive Roman Service. It is to be observed that, even when the elevation was authorised in England, genuflections were not authorised

[1] *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, pp. 10, 11.

by the rubrics of the Missals. Now, we know that the elevation of the Host was explicitly forbidden in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., and that it has never since been restored in the English Church. Immediately after the consecration of the elements, the direction is given, "These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the altar, without any elevation, or showing the Sacrament to the people." In this short sentence, the compilers of the Prayer Book of 1549 cut at the very root of a most important ceremonial development which had taken place without the consent of the whole Church, which seemed to them to foster questionable doctrine, and which any national Church had every right to reject. No direction appears in the Prayer Book of 1552, for the simple reason that it would have been superfluous; and we have no later record of the elevation or any of the consequent ceremonies having been practised until after the middle of the nineteenth century. With the exclusion of the elevation, its accompanying ceremonies—censing the Host, ringing of bells, and genuflections—ceased. The genuflections which were never authorised, and the ceremony which led to their introduction, alike disappeared. All this was, in fact, in regard to genuflections, as a slaying of the slain. Literally, "we have no such custom" in the English Church.

II.

Now let us pass on to consider the usage of the Roman Church in this matter. We will begin by again quoting Father Thurston. In the article before referred to (p. 396), he writes, "It is surely a striking fact that while the Holy Sacrifice has been offered for nineteen centuries, thirteen of those centuries should have passed away before the priest who offered it was ever seen to bend his knee to the ground in the gesture so familiar at our altars now. I do not advance this as in any sense a novel discovery. The fact is familiar to all who possess a moderate acquaintance with liturgical history."

In *Ordo Romanus* xiv., said to have been written by Cardinal James Cajetan, under Pope Clement VI., A.D. 1342–52, we find, ". . . teneat Hostiam cum digitis utriusque manus, et proferat distincte ac devote verba consecrationis; quibus dictis, ipse primo adoret inclinato capite sacrum divinum corpus; deinde reverenter et attente ipsum elevet in altum adorandum a populo . . . prosequatur verba consecrationis usque ad illum locum, *remissionem peccatorum*. Quibus finitis, inclinato paululum capite adoret sacrum Domini sanguinem, et elevet adorandum a populo. . . . Cum autem dicet, *Supplices te rogamus*, etc., manibus cancellatis ante pectus . . . inclinet ante altare."[1] "Let him hold the Host with

[1] Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. pp. 304, 305, Paris. 1689.

the fingers of each hand, and let him clearly and reverently pronounce the words of consecration; when he has said these words let him first adore with head inclined the holy and divine body himself, and then let him reverently and carefully elevate it on high to be adored by the people . . . let him continue the words of consecration as far as the place, *remissionem peccatorum*. This done, let him adore the holy blood of the Lord with head slightly inclined, and let him elevate it to be adored by the people. . . . And when he says, *Supplices te rogamus*, etc., with hands joined before his breast . . . let him incline before the altar."

The earliest printed Roman Missal known to us, namely that printed at Milan in 1474,[1] contains no directions for gestures of reverence at the consecration; and it is not till we come to 'Supplices te rogamus,' well beyond the consecration, that we find, *Hic inclinet se*. And the same remark applies to the Roman Missals of 1485, 1493, 1505, and 1509.[2] In point of fact, genuflection during the Canon was not ordered to be made by the rubrics of the Roman Missal, until the revision under Pius V. in 1570.[3] This date, according to Archbishop

[1] *Missale Romanum*, 1474, edited by Dr. Lippe, Henry Bradshaw Soc.

[2] It is right to say, that the absence of directions in the printed missals to show reverence to the Consecrated Elements cannot be held to prove that such was not done in practice, even though not authorised.

[3] "It is not an easy matter to find a pre-Pian edition of the Roman Missal, even with the resources of the British

Trench's liberal computation, is half a century and more later than the close of the middle ages. Thus, even according to Roman authority (and it is of *authorised* ceremonial we are speaking), genuflection at Mass is not, strictly speaking, a medieval ceremony. What then becomes of the assumption that the ceremonial of the modern and medieval Roman Church is identical? And what then becomes of the superstructure which certain Anglicans during the last fifty or sixty years have built on such a fallacy? But, to go back. Quoting Father Thurston again, we read (p. 397), "With regard to this particular point of the genuflections to the Blessed Sacra-

Museum at our disposal, that directs the celebrant to genuflect at or after the moment of consecration. Some of the Roman Missals printed at Paris before 1570, direct the priest to adore cum mediocri inclinatione, but not more."—*Mediæval Ceremonial*, Ch. Quar. Rev., xlix. 410.

John Burchardt, in his *Ordo Missæ*, printed at Rome in 1502 (which was incorporated in the rubrics of the Roman Missal of 1570), distinctly orders genuflection at the consecration. After the consecration of the Host, we read, "*genuflexus eam adorat*": after that of the Chalice, "*et genuflexus sanguinem reverenter adorat.*"—Ordo Missæ, pp. 213b, 214a, in Cochleus, *Speculum Missæ*, Venetiis, 1572. Also *Pontificale secundum ritum sacrosancte Romane Ecclesie*, Lugduni, 1542, fol. ccxxvii., has, "Tum Pontifex benedicit et verba consecrationis distincte et reverenter profert, mox ipse genuflexus consecratam hostiam devote adorat."

As late as the year 1531, Bishop Gavin Dunbar forbade genuflection at Aberdeen on passing the reserved Sacrament—"humiliter se inclinent, non genua flectentes, sed caput et corpus." See Eeles, *Reservation of the Holy Eucharist in the Scottish Church*, p. 35. Mowbray, 1900.

ment, the testimony of our manuscript Missals is negative, but very significant. In his *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Missale Romanum*, Dr. Ebner has paid particular attention to the rubrics found in the Canon of the very large number of Missals examined by him in Italian libraries. There is not apparently a single instance, certainly not among those of earlier date, in which a genuflection is prescribed for the celebrant at or after the consecration." Father Thurston then goes on to give, as a specimen of the sort of rubrics found annexed to the Canon in manuscripts most rich in rubrics, the directions contained in a Franciscan Missal, written at the beginning of the fourteenth century (Vatican, Regina, 2048). The rubrics quoted are those which follow the prayer, *Hanc igitur*. They are as follows :

Hic accipiens hostiam reverenter tenet eam junctis manibus dicendo : Qui pridie, *et teneat ipsam usque :* Simili.
Qui pridie. . . . HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM.
Hic deponat hostiam et levet calicem dicens : Simili modo . . . gratias agens.
Hic deponat calicem in altare tenens eum sinistra manu, dextra benedicat ; benedictione facta elevet et teneat eum usque : Unde et memores.
Bene ✠ dixit . . . mei memoriam facietis.
Hic reponat calicem.
Unde et memores, &c. [with crosses] . . . immaculatam hostiam.
Hic inclinet se sacerdos et dicat : Supplices, &c.

From these rubrics, printed in italics, which are much fuller than those in most manuscript

Missals, it will be seen that no mention whatever of genuflection is made, nor even any act of external adoration to the Host after consecration. On the other hand, any genuflection after the consecration of the Chalice seems to be practically inconsistent with the clear direction to hold the chalice in the hand, until the words, Unde et memores.

The following are the rubrics in the Constanz Missal of 1579:—

Inclina te. Hanc igitur . . . electorum tuorum jubeas *Eleva te.* grege numerari . . . ut nobis Cor ✠ pus et San ✠ guis *Leva brachia et manus in altum* fiat dilectissimi filii tui Dñi nostri Jesu Christi.

Accipe cum reverentia hostiam tersis ad corporale digitis. Qui pridie . . .

Hic extende brachia in modum crucis. Unde et memores . . . .

Inclina te cancellatis manibus. Supplices te rogamus . . . .

No more rubrics as to posture are found till after *Agnus Dei* (which immediately follows *Haec commixtio*) then:—

Inclina te ad altare, et dic. Domine Jesu Christi qui dixisti . . .

Then *Pax Christi* . . . and *Habere vinculum* . . . then:—

Inclinans dic hanc orationem, antequam communices. Domine Jesu Christe fili Dei vivi . . .

No more directions for gestures are given.

The 1503 missal agrees with all this.

In the Charterhouse Missal of 1679,[1] before the Canon stands the rubric,

Sacerdos profunde inclinatus ante altare junctis manibus dicit.

Te igitur . . .

[1] *Missale Cartusiani*, Fauratii in Sabaudia . . . 1679.

During the *Commemoratio pro Vivis*, after the words, omnium circumstantium, there occurs in the margin, *Hic reverenter inclinat.*

During the *Infra Canonem*, at the words, Mariæ Genetricis Dei, there is in the margin, *Hic reverenter inclinat.*

In the Charterhouse Missal, there is no gesture of reverence or adoration ordered at the consecration; and nothing of the sort occurs till the Supplices te rogamus, where *Inclinatus ante altare, cancellat manus*, is found.

It is certainly very remarkable that the inclination at 'Supplices te rogamus'[1] is ordered in all the Liturgies, and that the old ritualists speak of it before this prayer, which was always looked upon as full of mystery. Upon its signification, Amalarius says, "Nempe Christus oravit in cruce, incipiens a Psalmo, *Deus Deus meus*, usque ad versum, *in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum.* Postea inclinato capite, emisit spiritum. Sacerdos inclinat se, et hoc quod vice Christi immolatum est, Deo Patri commendat."[2] "For Christ prayed on the cross, beginning with the psalm, *My God, My God*, as far as the verse, *into Thy hands I commend my spirit.* Afterwards he bowed his head and gave up the ghost. The priest bows himself, and this because the

[1] It is referred to in *Ordo Romanus* ii., "Et sacerdos, quando dicit, *Supplices te rogamus*, humiliato capite, inclinat se ante altare:" also in *Ordo Romanus* iv., "Hic inclinat se juxta altare, dicens, *Supplices te rogamus.*"—Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. pp. 48, 61. Paris, 1689.

[2] Lib iii. cap. xxv. (col. 425, in Hittorpius, *De divinis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ officiis*, Paris, 1610).

sacrifice is offered instead of Christ. He commends it to God the Father." Similarly Micrologus says, "Male enim cauti sumus, si Christum imitari summopere non studemus. . . . Presbyter et humiliationem Domini usque ad crucem, ut praedixımus nobis indicat: cum se usque ad altare inclinat, dicendo: *Hanc ergo oblationem.* Statim enim in sequentibus narrationem de Dominica Passione orditur, cujus typus usque ad, *Supplices te rogamus*, observatur. Ibi videlicet sacerdos se juxta altare inclinans, Christum in cruce inclinato capite spiritum tradidesse significat."[1] "We are careful to no purpose if we are not zealous to imitate Christ in everything that we can. . . . As we said before, the priest represents to us the humiliation of our Lord even unto the cross, when he bows himself to the altar saying, *Hanc ergo oblationem.* For in the following [words] he at once begins the story of the Lord's passion, the figure of which is adhered to as far as, *Supplices te rogamus.* There indeed the priest, inclining himself close before the altar indicates that Christ, having bowed his head, gave up the ghost." Honorius of Autun says, "Sacerdos Christi mortem representat. Cum se (ad *Supplices te rogamus*, inclinat) et post ejus mortem apte commemoratio defunctorum agitur, qui pro eis mortuus creditur."[2]

[1] *De Ecclesiasticis Observationibus*, cap. 16, in Hittorpius, coll. 740, 741. Paris, 1610.

[2] *Gemma Animæ*, in Hittorpius, col. 1196.

"The priest represents the death of Christ when he inclines at *Supplices te rogamus*, and the commemoration of the dead is very fittingly made after the death of him whom we believe to have died for them."

It is most significant that the inclination at *Supplices te rogamus*, is the only gesture of reverence ordered in the Canon of the Roman Missals of 1474, 1485, 1493, 1505, 1509, as we have already observed.

In the Mozarabic Missal,[1] at the beginning of the Canon stands the rubric, *Deinde dicat sacerdos in silentio, junctis manibus, inclinando se ante altare:* after the words, et gratias agens, is found, *inclinet se.* No gesture of reverence or act of adoration is prescribed after the consecration. This is all the more remarkable, since we find *Hic genuflectitur* at the Incarnatus in the Creed, which in the Gothic rite follows the elevation.

The comparatively late date when directions to genuflect first appear in the Roman Missal is possibly to be explained from reverence for the primitive tradition, which forbade kneeling on the Lord's day and during Eastertide. This tradition which, as will be seen later, was emphasized at the Council of Nicæa, can be traced back to the second century. It was well established in the time of Tertullian, who (*de Corona*, c. iii.) says, "Christians consider it unlawful to pray to God on their knees on the

[1] *Missæ Gothicæ et Officii Muzarabici.* Toleti, 1875.

Lord's days." Kneeling was, in the early days of Christianity held to signify penitence ;[1] and both penitence and fasting were held to be inconsistent with the thanksgiving and joy, with which the commemoration of the Resurrection was associated. Neither penitence nor fasting were permitted on the Lord's day, or during the great forty days following Easter day.[2]

It is most significant to observe, that the directions for the celebrant to genuflect at the consecration, first appeared in the Roman Missal of 1570, that is, within six years of the close of the Council of Trent, at which the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation was formulated. This Missal is, in fact, the authoritative Missal of the Council of Trent, which appeared under the auspices of pope Pius V. in the year 1570.

It is full of suggestion to notice how, latterly, the practice of genuflection has been extended, in the Roman Church, from the Eucharist to the crucifix on the high altar. Amongst the answers to correspondents in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* of August 1892, the following words occur, "It seems not to be generally known that the faithful, entering a church at any time, should genuflect to the cross on the high altar, even though the Blessed Sacra-

[1] "The bending of the knees is as a token of penitence and sorrow."—Cassian. Coll. xxi. c. xx. p. 795.

[2] See *The Fasting Days*, Staley, pp. 32, 33, note.

ment is not preserved in the tabernacle. The celebrant, going to the altar to say Mass, or returning from saying Mass, prelates and the canons of the cathedral church are alone excepted from this rule. 'So that,' to translate the words of De Herdt (tom i. n. 119), 'all, except canons of the cathedral church, and the others above mentioned, ought to genuflect before the cross of the high altar, even outside Mass.'" What will be the next development, in the matter of reverences, in the Roman Church, we know not.

III.

When we pass from the Roman Missals to the earliest known manuscript of the Sarum Missal (written about the year 1290), we find the same remarkable absence, not only of genuflections, but also of inclinations, after the consecration. The following are the rubrical directions surrounding the consecration. The rubrics quoted are those which follow the prayer, Hanc igitur.

After Quam oblacionem, and immediately before Qui pridie, is :—

Hic elevet hostiam contra pectus : dicendo,

Qui pridie . . .

. . . gracias agens. bene✠dixit *hic faciat signum fractionis dicendo*, fregit . . . . . corpus meum.

Hic elevet alcius corpus ut videatur ab omnibus, et postea humiliter reposito : teneat calicem inter manus et parumper elevet dicens,

Simili modo . . . . . ex eo omnes. *Hic elevet calicem contra pectus : dicendo,* Hic est enim calix . . . . memoriam facietis.

Calice humiliter reposito, et cooperto, extendat manus in modum crucis dicendo,

Unde et memores . . . . inmaculatam hostiam.

Hic cancellatis manibus et corpore inclinato, dicat,

Supplices te . . . . . ut quotquot, *hic erigat se et osculetur altare dicens,* ex hac altaris . . . . . *hic percuciat pectus suum, dicens,*

Nobis quoque . . . .

In the earliest printed edition of the Sarum Missal of the year 1492,[1] we find, as already observed, the same features:

Hic erigat sacerdos manus et coniungat: et postea tergat digitos, et elevet hostiam, dicens, Qui pridie . . . . et, elevatis oculis in cœlum, *Hic elevet oculos suos,* ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem, *Hic inclinet se, et postea elevet paululum, dicens,* tibi gratias agens, bene✠dixit, fregit, *Hic tangat hostiam, dicens,* deditque discipulis suis, dicens, Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes, HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM.

Et debent ista verba proferri cum uno spiritu et sub una prolatione, nulla pausatione interposita. Post hæc verba elevet eam supra frontem, ut possit a populo videri: et reverenter illam reponat ante calicem in medium crucis per eandem factæ. Et tunc discooperiat calicem et teneat inter manus suas, non disjungendo pollicem ab indice nisi dum facit benedictiones tantum, ita dicens,

Simili modo posteaquam cœnatum est, accipiens . . . tibi, *Hic inclinet se, dicens,* gratias agens, bene✠dixit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens, Accipite et bibite ex eo omnes. *Hic elevet sacerdos parumper calicem . . . ita dicens,* HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI . . . PECCATORUM.

Hic elevet calicem, dicens, HÆC . . . IN MEI MEMORIAM FACIETIS.

Hic reponat calicem et elevet brachia sua in modum crucis, junctis digitis, usque ad hæc verba, de tuis donis ac datis.

Unde et memores.

[1] *Missale ad usum Insignis et Præclaræ Ecclesiæ Sarum.* Burntisland, 1861.

From an examination of the foregoing rubrics of the Sarum Missal, printed here in italics, it will be seen that the priest is directed to incline *before* the consecration of both the bread and the cup; and that there is no direction for any act of adoration *after* the consecration of either one or the other. The same remark applies equally to certain editions of the York Missal.[1] The Hereford Missal of 1502[2] has *inclinet se* before the consecration of the bread only. This apparently deliberate omission of directions for external acts of adoration after consecration, which is common to the earlier English Missals, is certainly very remarkable: it suggests a doctrinal question which we will not attempt either to state or to answer here. In the case of the Sarum Missal of 1492, quoted above, the omission is more noticeable, since, immediately preceding the prayer *Hanc igitur*, which commences the more solemn portion of the Canon, occur these words, *Hic respiciat sacerdos hostiam cum magna veneratione, dicens*, Hanc igitur. . . . The York Missal has a similar direction, namely, *Hic respiciat hostiam cum veneratione, dicens*, Hanc igitur. . . . It seems impossible to interpret the inclinations made before and during the act of consecration, as distinguished from those made after that act,

[1] See *Missale ad usum Insignis Ecclesiæ Eboracensis*, Surtees Soc., 1874.

[2] *Missale ad usum Percelebris Ecclesiæ Herfordensis*, Henderson, 1874.

as identical in meaning with the genuflections prescribed immediately after consecration in the modern Roman Missal.[1] The former seem to imply the priest's reverence during the solemn action of consecration: the latter are precise and definite acts of adoration of the Consecrated Elements, as stated in the rubric.

In connection with what has been said above, it is interesting to know, that at Lincoln Cathedral in the year 1236, the canons remained standing during the elevation, and only bowed their heads towards the altar. A similar custom obtained in many of the French dioceses down to comparatively recent times. The authority for the custom at Lincoln is found in *Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral*, H. Bradshaw and Chr. Wordsworth, Vol. ii. p. 152, §§ 26, 30. "Ad missam eciam sedetur post *Sanctus* usque ad aliud *Per omnia*: dum tamen erigant se in elevacione hostie, et ad altare se reverenter inclinent." "At mass also they sit from after the *Sanctus* till the other *Per omnia*: at the same time however, they should raise themselves at the elevation of the host, and reverently incline to[wards] the altar." The inclination here ordered is, it will be observed, "ad altare."

1 "Prolatis verbis consecrationis, statim Hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat. . . . Prolatis verbis consecrationis, deponit Calicem super corporale . . . genuflexus adorat."—*Missale Romanum*, Venetiis, 1713. These directions first appeared in the Roman Missal of Pius V., A.D. 1570. See footnote p. 10, of this article.

The only possible conclusion to be drawn from the facts stated above is, that, for the clergy in England, genuflection at the Eucharist is now, as it ever has been, unauthorised. We believe that we are right in saying, that, in the Oriental Liturgies, the priests in celebrating the Eucharist never bend the knee to the Consecrated Elements. Taking all these facts into consideration, genuflection during the recitation of the Canon cannot lay claim to be regarded as a Catholic custom.

It is to be understood that the foregoing remarks apply only to the clergy, who minister at the altar, not in a private but in an official capacity; and whose gestures are controlled by authority. The laity are not so bound, and we have no desire to attempt to regulate what they should do in the matter under discussion. Indeed, for the laity, there cannot be a better principle than that laid down in the rubric of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI.: "As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth, without blame."

It is interesting to observe, that the custom of genuflecting on the part of the faithful on approaching the altar for communion, and on leaving it after reception, is not required in the Roman Church. In a manual recently published under the auspices of the so-called Catholic Truth Society, we read, "It does not

seem to be necessary to kneel to the Blessed Sacrament before kneeling down at the rail. . . . It is not necessary to kneel to the Blessed Sacrament as you leave the rails."[1]

IV.

This essay would hardly be complete without some further allusion to the practice of the Oriental Church. We have said above, that genuflection is unknown during the recitation of the Canon. It sheds some light upon the subject of our enquiry to know, that, on a certain occasion, a priest of the Russian Church was asked how he reserved the Eucharist for the sick and dying; whereupon he took the enquirer to the place where the Eucharist was reserved, removed the pyx, and, without any sign of worship, opened it and showed the Consecrated Species. All this, gravely and reverently, but no gesture of adoration was made.[2] The withholding of sanction to genuflection during the Eucharist in the East is deliberate. It has its grounds in the 20th Canon of the Council of Nicæa, which is still remembered and acted upon in the present day in the Oriental Church. This Canon runs thus: "Because there are some who kneel on the Lord's day, and even in the

[1] *Catholic Customs*, A Guide for the Laity in England, pp. 22, 24.

[2] I am indebted for the account of this incident to *The Church Union Gazette*, May 2, 1892, p. 180.—V. S.

days of Pentecost," i.e. the 50 days after Easter day; "that all things may be uniformly performed in every parish, it seems good to the holy Synod, that prayers be made to God standing."[1] In early times kneeling was regarded as a penitential attitude, and thus an unfitting posture to be adopted during the Liturgy on Sundays, and the fifty days following Easter day, when the Church commemorates the Resurrection. Moreover, the Eucharist being regarded as the commemoration of the whole economy of the Incarnate Life of our Lord, of which the Resurrection was the glorious climax, kneeling or genuflection, as the attitude of humiliation, was naturally considered to be altogether inappropriate at that Service. This idea is admirably carried out, as far as the celebrant is concerned, in the Communion Service of The Book of Common Prayer, in which he is directed to kneel at two moments only—the Confession and the Prayer of Humble Access, both, be it observed, prayers of penitence and humility. At all other times during the Service he stands. The Easterns express their reverence for the Consecrated Elements by profound inclinations, which, as we have seen, were at other moments the authorised rule throughout the whole Western Church, until the revision of the rubrics of the Roman Missal in 1570. This

[1] *Canons of the First Four Councils*, Oxford, Parker, 1867, p. 21.

revision took place, it will be remembered, speaking generally, after the separation of England from Rome—that is to say, after the first stages of the English Reformation were accomplished. It will thus be seen how perfect was the agreement of the whole Catholic Church in this matter up to the closing years of the sixteenth century. Up to that period inclination at the Eucharist had every claim to be considered, relatively speaking, a Catholic custom: it was an universal practice.

We think enough has been said to show that, whilst nothing is to be said from an historical point of view, in support of the modern Roman custom of genuflecting during the Canon of the Book of Common Prayer, a good deal is to be said in favour of the old English custom of showing reverence by inclining, at least as far as the clergy are concerned.

NOTE.—The witness of the Carthusian Order against the practice of genuflection during the Canon is exceedingly strong and persistent. The Carthusians are the most conservative of all the Western religious orders, and they alone in the Western Church have preserved the primitive tradition of the priest not kneeling on Sundays at the Eucharist. At the present day, and for more than three centuries past, the celebrant in the Carthusian Mass, after the consecration of the Host, bows profoundly with bended knee, but not to the ground. "*Hoc est enim corpus meum. . . .* Quibus prolatis, sacerdos . . . profunde inclinatus, et genuflexus, non tamen usque ad terram, eam adorat." (*Ordinarium Cartusiense*, cap. xxvii. § 5. Parisiis, 1582. p. 84 *b*.) Even here we see that, whilst endeavouring to abide by the primitive tradition, the Carthusians have yielded in some measure to the pressure of example, if nothing more. In the *Ordinarium Cartusiense*, cap. xxvi. § 18, p. 80 *a*., we find the following comment on the reverence made by the assistants at the *Incarnatus* in the Creed: "Dum dicitur, *Et homo factus est*, ante medium altaris reverenter inclinat, et antequam se erigat osculatur altare; non tamen genua flectit. Nunquam enim ipse sacerdos, quandiu stat ad altare sacerdotalibus vestibus indutus, genua flectit, aut veniam pro defectibus capit; sed quando veniæ devotionis sunt sumendæ, incurvatus tantum corpore, altare osculatur." "At the words, *Et homo factus est*, the celebrant bows reverently before the middle of the altar, and before he raises himself he kisses the altar; but he does not bend the knee. For the priest himself, as long as he is standing at the altar clad in his sacerdotal vestments, never genuflects or prostrates himself for his defects; but when any reverence of devotion is to be made, he only bends his body and kisses the altar." Upon this matter Father Thurston thus speaks (*The Month*, Oct. 1897, p. 400), "It is commonly understood that the Carthusian priest does not in any proper sense genuflect while saying Mass (*nunquam in genua procumbit*). . . . There can be no reasonable doubt that, even if in the slight bending of the knees now practised in the Carthusian churches, they may have yielded something to the changing ritual of the rest of the world, their custom of not bowing the knee to the ground during Mass is a survival of what in former times was the universal usage."

Signing with the Cross at the Creeds.

Example of the origin of certain new rubrical directions, pp. 29, 30. Signing with the cross at the creeds possesses but slight authority, p. 31. Signing at the Apostles' Creed unauthorised in the West, p. 32. Possible origin of the custom, p. 33. Signing at the Nicene Creed in the Roman Church not very ancient, pp. 33, 34. Testimony of Belethus, and Durandus, pp. 34—36. Signing at the Nicene Creed apparently an extension of the signings at the Gospel and *Gloria in excelsis*, p. 37. Alternative explanation of the origin of the signing at the Apostles' Creed, pp. 37—39. Le Brun's reference of Rufinus, pp. 40, 41 n. No directions in the English missals for any signing at the Nicene Creed, p. 41; the only English authority for the gesture that at Lincoln, p. 42. No English authority for signing at the Apostles' Creed, p. 42. The liturgical moments when the public signings at mass in England were authorised, pp. 43—46. Conclusion, p. 47. *Note* 1., on the explanation of the symbolic meaning of the sign of the cross, p. 47. *Note* 2., on the importance of the signing at the liturgical Gospel, pp. 48, 49.

II.

SIGNING WITH THE CROSS AT THE CREEDS.

THE new incumbent of a certain church on the West coast of Scotland turned to the East to recite the Apostles' Creed, and signed himself with the cross at its conclusion. His back being towards the congregation, certain school-children standing in a row in the front, not fully understanding what their pastor did, must needs of course copy him: so they all took to scratching carefully their heads at the end of the Creed! The story does not go on to say, as it ought to do, whether or no the clergyman was questioned concerning his authority for the new gesture. Had he been asked to give his authority for the custom, he would probably have had no little difficulty in satisfying his questioners. Had his questioners been men of liturgical knowledge, we venture to think that he would not have been able to give any authority whatever for signing himself at the close of the Apostles' Creed. And this we will proceed to show.

An eminent Roman Catholic liturgical scholar has recently given us, as an example of the genesis of new rubrical directions in the Mass, the following account. Pope Leo

XIII. has ordered certain prayers to be said at the end of Low Mass, amongst which is the anthem *Salve Regina*. In celebrating, the former has noticed that the server, in answering this anthem, at the last line, "O clement, O pious, O sweet Virgin Mary," emphasises these words by smiting his breast, sometimes putting out of his hands biretta and cruets, in order to a more thorough performance of the ceremony—O clement (thump), O pious (thump), O sweet Virgin Mary (heavier thump). The writer whom we are quoting is considerably perplexed to give a reasonable account of this new development of smiting the breast. He can only come to the conclusion, to use his own words, "that the youthful mind, forming a hasty induction from the *Mea culpa*, the *Agnus Dei*, and the *Domine, non sum dignus*, has come to the conclusion that *omnia trina*, all things in threes, require to be emphasised when opportunity arises, by a banging of gongs, or at least by a symbolical punching of the chest; so after applying the lesson to the *Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus*, of the Preface, he has proceeded to extend it further to the epithets in the last line of the *Salve Regina*."[1]

I.

We have here a good statement of the method whereby a large number of persons,

[1] Thurston, *Genuflexion at Mass*, The Month, October, 1897, pp. 391, 392.

both clerical and lay, have adopted the custom of signing themselves with the sign of the cross at the conclusion of the Apostles' Creed. It is impossible to be ignorant, that the practice in question is very widespread in the English Church. It is, in fact, a gesture which has come to be regarded as the mark of "a good Catholic." And yet it is quite perplexing to be told, that it possesses no more rubrical authority, than the three strokes upon the breast, alluded to above, can boast of. In fact, it appears to have been introduced by a method of reasoning curiously like that adopted by the youthful servers, at whose hands Father Thurston suffered so considerably, and whom he so gently rebukes in commenting on the new ceremonial development during the saying of the *Salve Regina*. This may appear almost rude to those who have taken to signing themselves at the Apostles' Creed: but it is difficult to avoid the force of facts.

In the article "Sign of the Cross," in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*,[1] Mr. F. E. Warren gives a careful and detailed account of the various occasions on which the sign of the cross has been used in the Church from the earliest times. There is no mention of its use in connection with the recitation of the Creeds.[2] As far as the writer knows, there

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 1895, ff.

[2] In a letter to the author dated, January 28, 1901, Mr. Warren says, "I cannot recall any direction, Roman or Old English, for the cross at the end of the Apostles' Creed."

is positively no evidence whatever to be gained from the Service books of East or West, for the signing at the conclusion of the Apostles' Creed. This negative evidence is most remarkable, when we consider, as everyone possessing a very moderate acquaintance with the rubrics of the old Service books knows, the numerous occasions on which the sign of the cross is ordered to be made. The sign of the cross is not made now amongst Roman Catholics at the Apostles' Creed. Corsetti, in his *Praxis Sacrorum Rituum*,[1] mentions the signings at the choir offices, but says nothing about any signing at the Apostles' Creed. Falise, a typical modern Roman rubricist, in his *Sacrorum Rituum Elucidatio*,[2] gives a list of all crossings to be made in choir, amongst them that at the end of the Nicene Creed, but no mention is made of any signing at the conclusion of the Apostles' Creed. The present writer, after investigation, has been unable to discover any rubrical direction, English or foreign, for the sign of the cross at the Apostles' Creed.[3] And yet, strange to say, this

[1] Venice, 1739, pp. 121, 127, 129. [2] 1863, p. 126.

[3] The only trace, and it is very faint indeed, of any use of the sign of the cross in connection with the Apostles' Creed, in England, so far discovered, is that found in text E. page 21, line 219, of *The Lay Folks Mass Book*, E.E.T.S., where we see in a farsure of the creed a cross inserted thus—"done on the ✠ and ded he was." The sign may have been made here. In the Constanz Missals of 1503 and 1579, the Passau Missal of 1522, and other German Missals, there is the following—"homo factus est. ✠ Cruci-

signing has come to be regarded in certain quarters as a Catholic custom! How then are we to account for its recent introduction?

The allusion to the Abbé Falise's work, just made, suggests an answer to the question. In the modern Roman Missal, immediately before the Nicene Creed, is the rubric, "*In fine, ad* Et vitam venturi sæculi, *signat se signo crucis a fronte ad pectus.*" [1] "*In the end, at* And the life of the world to come, *he signs himself with the sign of the cross from the forehead to the breast.*" In the Ritus celebrandi Missam, we read similarly, "*Cum dicit,* Et vitam venturi sæculi, Amen, *producit sibi manu dextra signum crucis a fronte ad pectus.*" [2] "*When he says,* And the life of the world to come, Amen, *he traces upon himself with the right hand the sign of the cross from the forehead to the breast.*" Here, in this modern direction of the Roman Missal, we seem to find the source from which the signing with the cross at the conclusion of the Apostles' Creed appears to have been borrowed in recent times amongst us. We say, this *modern* direction of the Roman Missal; for, to tell the truth, the use of the sign of the cross at the conclusion of the Nicene Creed does not seem to be very ancient. No such direction is given

fixus . . ." The holy sign was evidently made in the Nicene Creed, as indicated by the cross. This use of the cross in connection with expression of belief in the Crucified is explained by Durandus, as will be seen later in this article.

[1] *Missale Romanum,* Venetiis, 1713.

[2] Cap. vi. § 3, Ibid.

in the Roman Missals of 1474 and 1554; nor in the Carthusian Missals of 1679 or 1771, where the rubrics are very full. Christopher Marcellus, in his *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum*, Libri tres, which appeared in 1516,[1] does not mention the signing at the Nicene Creed, though he describes that at the Gospel.[2]

When we examine the history of the signing at the end of the Nicene Creed in the Roman Church, a remarkable fact presents itself. It was, like genuflection during the Canon of the Mass, practised in the West at the close of the twelfth century, though not ordered in the rubrics of the Roman Missal until 1570. John Beleth, who is said by many authorities to have flourished about 1182,[3] wrote, "Pronuntiato symbolo, sub finem ipsius debet fieri signum crucis, quoniam verbum est evangelicum non secus atque ipsum Evangelium, nisi quod sit verbum abbreviatum. . . . Simi-

[1] This work was the precursor of the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, which appeared in 1600. In later editions of C. Marcellus' work, the title is altered to *Sacrarum Cæremoniarum*, and it is by this latter title that the book is generally known.

[2] Lib. ii. cap. 2, fol. lxx *b*, Venetiis, 1516.

[3] Other authorities however assign him a later date, namely, 1328. Vide Leslie Stephens, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885. The latest author quoted by Beleth seems to be Rupertus Tuitiensis, who died 1135: cf. Beleth's *Rationale*, cap. 123. Durandus, who wrote his *Rationale* about the year 1280–90, is said by Catalani to have followed Belethus: ". . . apud Joannem Belethum in Explicatio Divinorum Officiorum, ex quo auctore Durandus desumpsit."—Catalani, *Sacrarum Cæremoniarum*, Lib. ii. tit. i. cap. li. § 8. 4. Romæ, 1750.

liter quoque in omnibus verbis evangelicis signum crucis fieri oportet, quemadmodum sub finem Orationis Diminicæ, *Gloria in excelsis*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, et *Nunc Dimittis*, quæ omnia perinde atque Evangelium stando audiri debent."[1] "When the Creed has been said, the sign of the cross ought to be made just before the end, for the Creed is an evangelical form no less than the Gospel itself, except that it is a shortened form. . . . So too the sign of the cross ought to be made at all evangelical forms, as at the end of the Lord's Prayer, *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*, which like the gospel, ought all to be listened to standing."

Durandus, who wrote his *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum* during the latter half of the thirteenth century, names the crossing at the Nicene Creed as one of the signings usual in his time. In treating de Symbolo,[2] he justifies it on the ground of the connection of the Creed with the Gospel: the Creed is a summary of the Gospel, and therefore, in his eyes, Evangelical. It is to be observed that Durandus connects all the public signings with the Gospel. His words are, "Sane regulariter omnibus evangelicis verbis debemus facere signum crucis, ut in fine evangelii, symboli,

[1] *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, auctore J. Beletho, cap. xl. Migne, Patrologiæ, tom ccii.

[2] Durandus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Lib. iv. cap. 25. Lyons, per Jacobum Sacon, 1510.

dominicæ orationis, Gloria in excelsis Deo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei, Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel, Magnificat et Nunc Dimittis, et in principio horarum, et in fine missæ quando sacerdos dat benedictionem, et etiam ubicunque de cruce vel Crucifixo mentio fit."[1] "Now we ought to make the sign of the cross regularly at all evangelical forms, as, for example, at the end of the Gospel, of the Creed, of the Lord's Prayer, of Gloria in Excelsis Deo, Sanctus, sanctus, Agnus Dei, Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel, Magnificat and Nunc Dimittis, and at the beginning of [each] hour, and at the end of mass when the priest gives the blessing, and also wherever there is mention of the cross or of the Crucified."

Durandus, sub Evangelio, also mentions the signing at Gloria tibi Domine, before the Gospel.[2] John Burchardt, at the very beginning of the sixteenth century, speaks of the signing at the end of the Nicene Creed thus: "Et vitam venturi sæculi. Amen. *Et dum hæc ultima verba profert, producit manu dextra signum crucis a fronte ad pectus.*"[3] "And the life of the world to come. Amen. *And whilst he says these last words, he traces with his*

[1] Lib. v. cap. 2. See previous footnote, p. 32, note 3.

[2] Lib. iv. cap. 24.

[3] *Ordo Missæ*, in Cochleus, *Speculum Missæ*, Venetiis, 1572, p. 208 b. The first edition of Burchardt's *Ordo Missæ* appeared in 1502.

right hand the sign of the cross from forehead to breast."

From the foregoing, we gather that it was held that the signing at the Nicene Creed was an extension of the signing at the Gospel and *Gloria in excelsis*, which signings, as we shall see later in this article, are very ancient, and can claim great authority.

II.

There is, however, another explanation of the signing at the Nicene Creed, which has been suggested, — namely that it was originally borrowed from the earlier custom of signing at the end of the Apostles' Creed, which prevailed in a certain district of Italy in the fourth century. Rufinus, who was born in about the year 345, twenty years later than the Council of Nicæa, in his commentary on the Apostles' Creed, says, at the words, *Hujus carnis resurrectionem*, "Satis caute fidem Symboli Ecclesia nostra docet, quæ, in eo quod a cæteris traditur, *Carnis Resurrectionem*, uno additio pronomine tradidit, *Hujus carnis resurrectionem*, hujus, sine dubio, quam habet is qui profitetur, signaculo crucis fronti imposito; qui sciat unusquisque fidelium, carnem suam, si mundam servaverit a peccato, futurum esse vas honoris . . ."[1] "Very carefully does our Church teach the faith of the Creed,

[1] *De Fide et Symbolo*, ed. Heurtley, p. 167. Oxford, 1884. The date of Rufinus' Commentary is about the year 390.

because the sentence which is taught by the rest as *the resurrection of the flesh*, she teaches with the addition of a pronoun—*the resurrection of this flesh*, of this, without doubt, which he has who professes the faith, when he makes the sign of the cross on his forehead; so that each of the faithful may know that if they keep their flesh clean from sin, it will be a vessel of honour in time to come." The insertion of "hujus," before "carnis," was one of the peculiarities of the Creed of the Aquileian Church;[1] and it is fair to say that, in all probability, the signing named at the word "hujus," was at first merely a local peculiarity at that Church also. Mayer is of opinion that this particular practice spread from Aquileia to other Churches. "Verisimile igitur est, eundem usum ab Aquileiensi in alias Ecclesias postliminio dimanatum fuisse."[2] "So it is very likely that the same usage afterwards became spread abroad from the Church of Aquileia to other Churches." Mayer thus confirms the notion that the signing at the end of the Apostles' Creed was not the general custom, at least in its beginnings. Moreover, Rufinus' words naturally refer to the baptismal 'profession,' and not to any other recitation of the Apostles' Creed,

[1] See Smith's *Dic. of Christian Biography*, sub. Rufinus, Vol. iv. p. 560.

[2] *Explic. Cærem. Eccles.* Part ii. cap. xi. p. 245. Tugii, 1737.

which does not then appear to have existed except as a private matter. His words are therefore satisfied by the baptismal signing with the cross, and do not necessarily imply that the cross was used on other occasions at this point of the Apostles' Creed.

This theory of the adoption of a local custom of signing at the Apostles' Creed at Baptism, in the case of the later signing at the Nicene Creed, is very interesting. It is interesting, because, whilst the custom of signing at the Nicene Creed, was, in process of time, generally adopted on the continent, and ultimately incorporated in the rubrics of the Roman Missal in 1570, there is no evidence at present forthcoming that the signing at the Apostles' Creed was ever generally adopted outside the area of the Aquileian Church. The "Ecclesia nostra" of Rufinus' commentary refers to his own Church, and no other. In fact, as we have already observed, the signing in question is not practised in the Roman Church to-day. No argument, therefore, can be based on the words of Rufinus in regard to any general adoption of the custom in other Churches. It seems highly improbable that the practice of the Aquileian Church in the fourth century is the source and origin of the practice of signing at the end of the Apostles' Creed, recently introduced in some English churches. The theory that the signing at the Apostles' Creed in late years in England is copied

or borrowed from the Roman signing, now usual at the Nicene Creed, is much more probable.[1]

[1] Pierre le Brun, in his invaluable *Explication de la Messe* (Part ii. Art. viii. Vol. i. p. 275. Liege, 1777), has a reference to Rufinus' words, which we give in full with a translation. It is to be observed that Le Brun is commenting on the signing at the end of the Nicene Creed, and not at the Apostles' Creed.

"*Sur le signe de la croix que le prêtre fait à la fin du 'Credo.'* Le prêtre fait sur soi le signe de la croix en prononçant ces dernieres paroles: *Et vitam, etc.* On voit dans Rufin qu'au iv^e^ siecle tous les chrétiens faisoient sur eux le signe de la croix en finissant la récitation du Symbole des Apôtres. Ce Symbole finissoit alors dans la plupart des Eglises par *carnis resurrectionem*, comme nous l'apprennent le même Rufin, saint Jerôme, saint Augustin et plusieurs autres. On commençoit ce signe en disant *carnis*, et comme l'on portoit la main au front, on étoit déterminé à dire *carnis hujus resurrectionem*, pour montrer que c'étoit cette même chair qu'on touchoit, qui ressusciteroit. Quelque tems après on ajouta ces mots, *Vitam æternam*, *Amen*, qui marquoient quelle est la résurrection que nous croyons et que nous espérons. Saint Cyprien, au iii^e^ siecle, et Saint Cyrille de Jerusalem, au milieu du iv^e^, avoient marqué cette addition, ou cette explication, et elle devoit être assez commune en 381, lorsque les Peres du seconde concile mirent, dans le Symbole que nous expliquons, *Et vitam futuri sæculi.* Comme les chrétiens étoient accoutumés à finir la récitation du Symbole par le signe de la croix, le prêtre a observé est usage à la messe."

"*Upon the sign of the cross which the priest makes at the end of the Creed.* The priest signs himself with the cross in saying these last words, *Et vitam, etc.* We learn from Rufinus, that in the fourth century all Christians signed themselves with the cross at the end of the Apostles' Creed. This Creed concluded then in most Churches by *Carnis resurrectionem*, as we are taught by Rufinus, St. Jerome, St. Augustine and others. They began the signing in saying *carnis*, and, as the hand was raised to the forehead, point was given to the words *carnis hujus resurrectionem*, to show that it was the same flesh which they touched which should rise again. Some time after, were added these words:

III.

In the English Missals no direction, as we have already said, is given for any signing at the end of the Nicene Creed. The directions for the celebrant in the Sarum customs book are so full, that we may assume that it was unknown at Sarum. At the conclusion of the Nicene Creed, a bow only is prescribed.[1] Becon, in his scurrilous *The Displaying of the Popish Mass*, does not allude to it. In the *Legenda Aurea* (Caxton's edition, A.D. 1483), in the "History of the Mass," the crossings are described at the *Gloria tibi* before the Gospel, and at the *Benedictus qui venit;* but none is mentioned at the conclusion of the Creed. It is true that, in some German Missals, a cross is printed

Vitam æternum. Amen, which described what is the resurrection in which we believe and for which we hope. St. Cyprian, in the third century, and St. Cyril of Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth, had marked this addition or explanation, and it must have been quite common in 381, since the fathers of the second council put in the Creed, which we are explaining, *Et vitam venturi sæculi.* As the Christians were accustomed to finish the recitation of the Creed with the sign of the cross, the priest has observed this custom at the Mass." In reviewing this passage, we do not think that Le Brun is justified in applying Rufinus' words to "all Christians" (tous les Chrétiens). If the custom became at all general, it is most remarkable that it never was recognised in the Roman rubrics, and that it has entirely disappeared in the West until recently revived in the English Church. It is to be observed, too, that Rufinus is not commenting on the Mass Creed, but on the Apostles' Creed, and that he is referring to the profession of faith at Baptism. See p. 38, above. His allusion is quite inadequate to establish the practice in question.

1 See *The Use of Sarum*, Frere, p. 286.

between the words, homo factus est, and crucifixus, but not later in the Creed. The only English authority at present known for the gesture is that of the Lincoln customs book,[1] "Et hec crucis consignatio fit hic, . . . et in fine *Credo in unum*, cum dicitur, *Et vitam futuri seculi*." A solitary instance, such as this, is quite insufficient to establish the custom under review. In appealing to precedent, it is not the exception but the rule to which we are to look.

And, this being the case, in regard to the Nicene Creed, what can be said in favour of making the sign of the cross at the Apostles' Creed? If authority from precedent, as far as the English Church is concerned, is inadequate to establish the custom of signing at the Nicene Creed, it is much more so in the case of the Apostles' Creed. If our surmise as to the origin of the latter signing given above is correct, it is a pseudo-Roman custom—a corrupt following of the modern Roman practice of signing at the end of the Nicene Creed. Our only verdict must be, that, taken as a whole, it does not seem a practice that the clergy, at least, are bound to take up. It cannot be defended by any appeal either to authority or precedent, but appears to rest merely upon the sentiment of private individuals.

[1] *Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, H. Bradshaw and Chr. Wordsworth, Vol. ii p. 153, §§ 52, 54.

IV.

It may perhaps be well to say, in conclusion, at what liturgical moments (during the celebration of the Eucharist), the public signing of the person, as distinguished from the celebrant's private signing of the elements, is authorised by precedent. They are as follows; in the present order of the English rite:

i. At the response, *Gloria tibi Domine*, to the giving out of the Holy Gospel.

ii. At the beginning of the *Benedictus qui venit*, following the *Sanctus*.

iii. At the close of the *Gloria in excelsis*.

These three signings were the custom at Sarum, where the customs-book has, "ad *Gloria tibi Domine* semper ad altare se convertat, signo crucis se signans. Quod ter ad missam publice observetur, scilicet ad *Gloria in excelsis*, quando dicitur *in gloria Dei Patris;* et post *Sanctus* cum dicitur *Benedictus qui venit.*"[1] "At *Gloria tibi Domine*, (the choir) shall always turn to the altar and make the sign of the cross, which shall be made openly at mass three times; namely, in the *Gloria in excelsis*, when '*in gloria Dei Patris*' is said; and after the *Sanctus*, when '*Benedictus qui venit*' is said." At Lincoln, in the year 1236, we find, "Cum respondet *Gloria tibi Domine* debet se ad altare convertere et crucis signaculo communire. Et hec crucis consignatio fit hic et in fine *Gloria in excelsis*, cum dicitur *in gloria Dei Patris:* et in fine *Credo in*

[1] *The Use of Sarum*, Frere, pp. 21, 286.

unum, cum dicitur *et vitam futuri seculi:* et in fine *Sanctus*, cum dicitur *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini* . . . Ad *Gloria tibi Domine:* et tunc signo crucis se signent; quod (ter) ad Missam publice observetur, sc. ad *Gloria in excelsis*, quando dicitur *Dei Patris*, et ad *Gloria tibi Domine*, et post *Sanctus*, cum dicitur *Benedictus qui venit.*" [1] It will be observed here, as stated before, that this signing at the end of the Nicene Creed at Lincoln forms the only case yet discovered in old English uses. In the *Legenda Aurea*,[2] in "the History of the Mass," we read, "that the people be more incited to hear the Evangel of God, the priest representeth the place of God, and saith: *Sequentia sancti evangelii, et cetera*, in making the sign of the cross to the end that the enemy may not empesh (hinder) him: then the clerks and the people answer, *Gloria tibi Domine*. . . . . Then the priest saith the Evangel, the which finished and said, the priest warneth himself with the sign of the cross, to the intent that the enemy may not take away from the creatures' hearts the word of God . . . 'Blessed be he that cometh in the name of God,' and for this blessing, which is so sweet, the priest maketh a cross." The date of this portion of the *Legenda Aurea* is the first half of the fourteenth century.

[1] *Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, H. Bradshaw and Chr. Wordsworth, Vol. ii. p. 153, §§ 51–55; Vol. iii. p. 333.
[2] Vol. vii. pp. 233, 238, Dent & Co., 1900.

There is no mention of any crossing at the *Gloria in excelsis*. In Mr. Frere's edition of *The Exposition of the Mass*,[1] is an illumination showing the congregation signing at the Gospel, with the thumb of the right hand. *The Lay Folks' Mass Book* gives no direction for signing at the *Gloria in excelsis*, but at the beginning of the Holy Gospel,[2]—the priest, upon the book and upon the face; the people "a large cross on thee thou make," and a second signing at the end of the Gospel, "when it is done, thou make a cross," as given for the priest in the *Legenda Aurea*.[3] In Christopher Marcellus' *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum*, published at Venice in 1516, we read, "Cum autem dicit, *Sequentia Sancti Evangelii*, etc., signat cum pollice dextro librum, deinde frontem, os, et pectus."[4] "When he says *Sequentia Sancti Evangelii*, etc., he makes the sign of the cross with his right thumb, upon the book and upon his forehead, mouth, and breast." Lydgate's *Virtue of the Mass* (Harl. MS. 2251, fol. 182*b*.), has, "The Gospel begynnethe withe tokene of tau: the booke first crossed, and after the forehede." In the

[1] Alcuin Club Coll. ii. Plate 6.

[2] pp. 16, 18. E.E.T.S.

[3] The *Ordo Romanus* ii. notices the custom of public signing at the end of the Gospel in the following terms: "Perlecto evangelio, iterum se signo sanctæ crucis populus munire festinat."—Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. p. 46.

[4] Lib. ii. cap. ii. fol. lxx*b*. Venetiis, 1516.

Additions to the Rules of the sisters of Syon it is directed, "The *prose* or *sequence* ended, they schal turne to the auter, so enclynynge at the *Gloria tibi Domine*, whan the preste enclynethe, makyng a token of the crosse in ther forehedes, and upon ther brestes, as the maner is."[1] John Myrc, in his *Instructions for Parish Priests*,[2] has—

"And whenne the Gospelle I-red be schalle,
Teche hem thenne to stonde up alle,
And blesse hem[3] feyre as they conne
Whenne *Gloria tibi* ys by-gonne."

In *The Myroure of oure Ladye*, no crossing is named at the *Gloria in excelsis*, but only at the *Benedictus*, "At the begynnynge of *Benedictus*, ye turne to the aulter and make the token of the crosse upon you in mynde of our Lordes passyon."[4] The profane Becon refers in his usual odious manner to the priest's crossing at the Gospel, apparently at its close, "a piece of the Gospel being once read, they stroke themselves on the head and kiss the nail of their right thumb."[5]

[1] Aungier, *History and Antiquities of Syon Monastery*, p. 327; vide *The Lay Folks' Mass Book*, p. 217.

[2] E.E.T.S., p. 9, lines 278, ff.

[3] To "blesse hem" is, in Old English, to sign himself with the cross.

[4] E.E.T.S., p. 330. *The Myroure* was a book printed for the nuns of Syon, A.D. 1530.

[5] *Works*, iii. The Displaying of the Popish Mass, p. 257. Parker Soc.

We conclude our study by saying that, according to English pre-Reformation precedent, there is no authority whatever for any signing at the end of the Apostles' Creed; and the very slightest precedent for any signing at the conclusion of the Nicene Creed. The public signings during the Eucharist, are, as stated above, only three in number, namely: before the Gospel, at the *Benedictus*, and at the conclusion of the *Gloria in excelsis*. To these may be added the signing at the Benediction, at the conclusion of the Service.

NOTE I. Amongst the earliest explanations of the symbolic meaning of the sign of the cross, that of Innocent III.—elected pope in 1198, died 1216—given in his *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, Lib. ii. cap. 44, possesses considerable interest. "Est autem signum crucis tribus digitis exprimendum, quia sub invocatione Trinitatis imprimitur, de qua dicit propheta: *Quis appendit tribus digitis molem terræ* (Isai. xl.), ita quod de superiori descendit ad inferius, et a dextra transeat ad sinistram, quia Christus de cœlo descendit in terram, et a Judæis transivit ad gentes. Quidam tamen signum crucis a sinistra producunt in dextram, quia de miseria transire debemus ad gloriam, sicut et Christus transivit de morte ad vitam, et de inferno ad paradisum, præsertim ut seipsos et alios uno eodemque pariter modo consignent."

"Now, the sign of the cross is to be formed with three fingers, because it is imprinted under the invocation of the Trinity, of which the prophet says: 'Who hath comprehended the dust of the earth in three fingers' (Isai. xl. *Vulgate*), so that it descends from the upper part to the lower, and crosses over from the right hand to the left, because Christ came down from heaven to earth, and crossed over from the Jews to the Gentiles. Some however make the sign of the cross from left to right because we ought to go from misery to glory, like as Christ also

passed from death unto life, and from the place of darkness to paradise, especially so that they sign both themselves and others in one and the self-same manner."

NOTE II. On the importance of the signing with the cross at the liturgical Gospel, the following may serve:

"Dum titulum S. Evangelii diaconus cantat, signat crucis signo primo librum, deinde seipsum. Ritus ille antiquissimus est, et in Ordinariis Romanis præceptus; cujus expositio in Missali Athanatensi anni 1556, his verbis exprimitur: *Librum signat, ac si dicat, hic autem est liber Crucifixi. Sacerdos autem vel diaconus Evangelium lecturus se signat in fronte, in ore, et in pectore, quasi dicat, non erubesco Evangelium, ipsum ore prædicare, et corde credere.* Simili cruce se signant fideles, qui assistunt, non minus antiquo more. Quam dum olim formabant, hæc verba adjiciebant: *Crucis virtute signo muni Domine omnes sensus meos ad audienda verba S. Evangelii corde credenda, et opere complenda.* Quae formula extat in antiquissimo Codice San-Dionysiano, tempore Caroli M. exarato. . . . Habetur præterea ex Ordine Romano secundo, populum ad finem Evangelii iterum signo crucis se munire consuevisse, (quæ quidem consuetudo etiamnum viget in plebe nostra) *ut quod ex divinis eloquiis ad salutem percepit, signatum sigilo crucis atque munitum permaneat.*" —Mayer, *Explicatio Ceremoniarum Ecclesiasticarum*, Tugii, 1737, pp. 220, 226.

"When the deacon sings the title of the Holy Gospel, he first signs the book and then himself with the sign of the cross. This is a very ancient rite, and is prescribed in the Roman *Ordines*; there is an explanation of it in the Ainay Missal of the year 1556, in these words: 'He signs the book as if to say, Now this is the book of the Crucified. And when the priest or deacon is about to read the Gospel he signs himself on his forehead, on his mouth, and on his breast, as if to say, I am not ashamed of the Gospel—either to preach it, or to believe it in my heart.' In like manner the faithful who assist sign themselves with the cross, and by a custom no less ancient. At one time when they did this, they added these words:

'Defend, O Lord, all my senses with the sign of the life-giving cross, that, hearing the words of the Holy Gospel, I may believe them in my heart, and fulfil them in my actions.' This form exists in the very ancient Codex San-Dionysius, written in the time of Charles the Great. . . . Furthermore, we gather from the second *Ordo Romanus*, that the people were also accustomed to defend themselves with the sign of the cross at the end of the Gospel (and indeed this custom still flourishes among our people), 'that that which they receive to their health from the divine words may remain signed and defended with the seal of the cross.'"

The signing at the Gospel is referred to in *Ordo Romanus* i., "Et postquam dixerit *Sequentia sancti Evangelii*, facit crucis signum in fronte sua idem diaconus, et in pectore; similiter episcopus et omnis populus."—Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. pp. 45, 46, Paris, 1689: also in *Appendix Ordinis Romani*, Ibid. p. 553, "Diaconus cum ascendit ad legendum . . . et populus signum sanctæ crucis singuli faciunt in frontibus suis, ut per signum sanctæ crucis sint loricati: quatenus nulla fantasia diabolicæ fraudis aditum inveniat introeundi in corda eorum, et auferre possit semen evangelii de manibus eorum."

"And after the deacon has said *Sequentia sancti Evangelii*, he makes the same sign of the cross on his forehead, and on his breast: likewise the bishop and all the people." "When the deacon goes up to read [the Gospel] . . . the people also make the sign of the holy cross, each upon his forehead, that they may be defended by the sign of the holy cross: that no illusion of the deceit of the devil may find an entrance to go into their hearts, and carry away the seed of the Gospel from their hands."

The first *Ordo Romanus*, quoted above, dates from the early part of the eighth century.

The second *Ordo Romanus*, quoted above, is a Gallican recension of the first *Ordo Romanus*, and is not strictly speaking Roman.

The Position of the Reader of the Liturgical Epistle.

Utility, authorization, symbolism, the normal order in regard to ceremonial, pp. 53—55. Caution necessary in any appeal to mere utility, p. 55. Undesirable customs concerning the reading of the liturgical Epistle, pp. 55, 56. Testimony of Le Brun as to reader facing the people, pp. 56—57. The Roman custom, p. 57; its origin, pp. 58—62. Disuse of the ancient ambones, pp. 60, 62. History of the Roman custom, pp. 62, 63; its supposed symbolic meaning, p. 63. In the English Church, the Epistle to be read to the people, pp. 64; in accordance with declared English principles, pp. 65—67. Further evidence produced from English precedent, pp. 67—70. Conclusion, 70. *Note* 1., on the continental custom of reading the liturgical Scriptures in the vernacular, pp. 71, 72. *Note* 2., on the use of ambones, p. 72. *Note* 3., testimony of Bishops Andrewes and Cosin, pp. 72, 73.

III.

THE POSITION OF THE READER OF THE LITURGICAL EPISTLE.

IT is hardly open to question, that all good ceremonial observances are reasonable; that is to say, they are founded on good reasoning, and so commend themselves to common sense. We find this to be the case in almost every piece of authorised ceremonial of the Church. At first, a given ceremony is introduced because of its usefulness[1]: its usefulness being proved and acknowledged, the Church next authorises it: and, being authorised, a symbolical meaning becomes in due time attached to it. To state this process in other words:—a custom commends itself by its convenience; its prevalence attracts the notice of the authorities, who, adapting themselves to circumstances and the public opinion,

1 Upon this question of the practical nature of ceremonial, Mr. Edmund Bishop, in his *Genius of the Roman Rite*, pp. 12, 13, says, in regard to the oblation, "There are careful and somewhat lengthy directions as to the mode in which these offerings are to be collected. It is of importance, however, to observe that these directions are not ceremonial, but simply practical, purely practical, to ensure good order or to prevent blundering." And, again, "The thing had to be done, and it was done in a plain and simple but the most practical manner."

give it their sanction; when sanctioned and established, it is found advisable to justify the custom by attaching a meaning to it.[1] This fairly represents what has taken place again and again in the history of ceremonial. Utility: authorization: symbolism:—this represents the normal order in the matter of religious ceremonies.

For example, in regard to the use of lights and incense, Bishop Andrewes wrote—"There were *lights*, there was *incense* used by the primitive Church, in their service. Not for any mystical meaning, but (as it is thought) for this cause: that where the Christians in time of persecution had their meetings most commonly in caves and grots under-ground, places dark and so needing *light*, and dampish and so needing good *savours*, they were enforced to provide *lights* against the one, and *incense* against the other. After, whence peace came, though they had churches then above-ground, with light and air enough, yet retained they

1 "Sunt etiam multi ejusmodi ritus, qui initio ob solam causam naturalem, veluti ob necessitatis, commodi, decorive causam introducti sunt; quibus tamen postea mystica significatio accessit. Ita: cingulum ad vinciendam albam præscripsit Ecclesia; sed subinvoluit illum esse etiam puritatis symbolum. Nonnulli tales ritus progressu temporis in mysterium penitus abieri. Exemplum in manipulo habemus, qui olim erat pannus lineus ad sudorem abstergendum destinatus; nunc vero purum ornamentum seu symbolum est, admonens sacerdotes: quod laborare pro Deo et sudorem pro mercede sempiterna fundere debeant."—*Liturgica Sacra Catholica*, Carolus Kozma de Papi, p. 7, 2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1863.

both the *lights* and the *incense*, to show themselves to be the sons and successors of those ancient Christians, which, in former times, had used them (though upon other occasion), showing their communion in the former faith, by the communion of the former usages. Whereto the after-ages devised meanings and significations of their own, which from the beginning were not so." [1]

We, in the English Church, need to be very careful in making any appeal to mere utility in justification of the introduction of new ornaments and ceremonies; because almost every piece of illegal or undesirable ceremonial from which we are now suffering has been introduced on the score of its utility. In the present distracted state of the English Church, in regard to ceremonial, it is surely primarily imperative to conform literally to the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, as the only hope of attaining some degree of uniformity. When the rubrics are obeyed all round, it will be time enough to begin to think of ceremonial enrichment on the score of utility—not before.

Now, there is a custom, of which we are about to treat, in recent years intruded in some of our churches upon the faithful, for which, as matters now stand in the English Church, neither utility, ecclesiastical sanction, nor reasonable symbolism, can be rightly

[1] *Minor Works*, pp. 33, 34. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.

claimed. We refer to the custom of reading the Epistle at the Eucharist towards the East, and so away from the congregation. This custom is closely associated with another practice, which can only be similarly described —that of the faithful kneeling upon their knees, whilst the Epistle is being read towards the East.[1] In fact, this latter custom may be said, broadly speaking, to have arisen from the former, as its natural consequence. How have these customs been recently introduced in England?

I.

In the early *Ordines* and liturgical writers, we find no trace of reading the Epistle or the Gospel with the reader's face turned away from the people. Pierre Le Brun, the learned Roman liturgiologist, states that the Oriental custom is to read the Epistle, the reader facing the people, that is, westward. He says, "Les Arméniens sont louables d'avoir conservé l'ancien usage de l'Église d'Orient, . . . Les lecteurs se tenant dans le chœur chantent la Prophétie et l'Épître tournés vers le peuple."[2] "The Armenians are praiseworthy in having preserved the ancient usage of the Eastern Church, . . . The readers in the choir sing the Prophecy and the Epistle turned

[1] See the following article in this volume.

[2] *Explication de la Messe.* Diss. x. Art. 14, Vol. iii. p. 160. Liege, 1778.

towards the people." Previously, in allusion to the modern rubric of the Roman Missal, which directs the celebrant to read the Epistle *submissa voce* to himself whilst the subdeacon is chanting it, Le Brun says, "L'usage ancien et plus natural est que tout le monde écoute le soudiacre."[1] "The ancient and more natural custom is that everyone listens to the subdeacon." Durandus, who wrote his celebrated treatise, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, during the second half of the thirteenth century, mentions that it was the custom in his time to chant the Epistle towards the altar —"Facies autem Epistolam legentis respicere debet altare," adding, as is his wont, as a symbolical reason, "quod Christum significat," with an allusion to St. John Baptist going before the face of our Lord.[2] "The face of the one who reads the Epistle ought to look towards the altar, because (the Epistle) foreshadows Christ." The present practice of the Roman Church is, as we have said before, for the celebrant at High Mass to read the Epistle to himself facing East; whilst the subdeacon sings it aloud, facing East also. The rubric runs thus: "In Missa solemni subdiaconus . . . vadit ad partem Epistolæ contra altare, et cantat Epistolam, quam etiam celebrans interim submissa voce legit, assistente sibi

[1] *Explication de la Messe*, Part ii. Art. 5, Vol. i. p. 200. See later in the present work.

[2] Lib. iv. cap. xvi.

diacono a dextris."[1] "At a solemn Mass the subdeacon goes to the Epistle-side facing the altar, and sings the Epistle, which the celebrant also reads meanwhile in a low voice, the deacon standing by him on the right."

If we enquire how the Roman method of reading the Epistle to the altar, away from the people, has been arrived at in the course of time, we find apparently that the process has been that described at the commencement of this article. The custom seems to have been established on the score of practical utility, in view of the Epistle being in Latin, leading to ecclesiastical sanction, and followed by attempted symbolical justification. At least such an explanation is natural, if not obvious. The ancient practice was to read the Epistle from the ambo or pulpit outside the choir, turning towards the people; in fact, in the same position as the sermon. So Bona states: "Solebant autem antiquitus tam Epistola quam Evangelium legi in ambone seu pulpito, ex quo etiam episcopus conciones habebat."[2] "The Epistle and Gospel used anciently to be read in the ambo or pulpit, from which also the bishop used to preach." Sometimes the reader faced South, in order that he might be heard both by the clergy in the choir and at the altar, and also by the people in the nave or body of the church. In adopting this

[1] Missale Romanum. *Ritus celebrandi Missam*, vi. § 4.
[2] *Rerum Liturg.* Lib. ii. cap. 6, § 3. Antwerp, 1739.

posture, the reader avoided turning his back on any of his hearers.[1]

In cases where, from the size of the church, the reader in the ambo was with difficulty heard by the clergy at the altar, it was the custom to read the Epistle also in the choir for the benefit of the clergy, and facing the altar. Mabillon, in his *Iter Italicum*, A.D. 1685, refers to his visit to the church of St. Clement at Rome, where he saw three ambones, which he thus describes; "Tres sunt in inferiori choro ambones, unus ex parte Evangelii,

1 "The reading of the Epistle and Gospel at the altar is in itself modern; in early times they were read in the ambo, pulpit, or rood loft; and an examination of these ancient ambones will show us that the Scripture lessons were, and still are, read in many churches so as to be best heard of all such as are present. In the Collegiate Church of St. Ambrose at Milan, the ambo is in the nave, on the north side of the church, the reading desk being placed so that the reader faces direct south. The lection (which in the Ambrosian rite precedes the Epistle), the Epistle, and the Gospel, are all read from this desk, an arrangement better than any other for letting both clergy and people hear the words read. The sermon follows from the same place. In the Metropolitan Church at Milan there are two ambones facing each other on the north and south side of the church at the end of the nave, the gospel desk facing south, the epistle north. So in St. Mark's at Venice there are two ambones at the east end of the nave; from which the Gospel and Epistle are read. Sermons are preached from the epistle ambo. At Pisa the same arrangement exists as in the Metropolitan Church at Milan; and instances might be extended almost indefinitely of ancient ambones in Italy and Spain which have their desk directed to the south; or even turned towards the nave, to the south-west."—J. Wickham Legg, *On Some Ancient Liturgical Customs now falling into Disuse.* St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans. Vol. ii. pp. 124, 125.

duo ex parte Epistolæ: quorum alter lectorium habet versus altare pro lectionibus ad chorum sacerdotum; alter pro epistola Missæ versus populum."[1] "There are three desks in the lower (part of the) choir, one on the Gospel side, two on the Epistle side: of which one has the place for the book turned towards the altar for reading the lessons to the choir of priests; the other desk is for the epistle of the Mass, and is turned towards the people." Catalani, however, speaks of the Epistle-ambo in the church of St. Clement, as turned towards the altar (see note i. below). Ciampini states that the ancient ambones in Rome fell into disuse during the removal of the pontifical chair to Avignon in the year 1309.[2] Pierre Le Brun remarks, "*Quand on chante l'Epître, le Prêtre la lit à voix basse.* L'usage ancien et le plus naturel est que tout le monde écoute le soudiacre, et

[1] *Museum Italicum*, Vol. i. p. 60. Paris, 1687. Catalani refers to the arrangements of the church of St. Clement as follows, "Locus legendæ Epistolæ, ut aliquid de antiquo ritue dicamus, erat ambon ad id destinatus, extabatque in cancellis dextris chori versus altare. In vetustissima S. Clementis in Urbe Ecclesia, quæ hodie est Fratrum Ordinis Prædicatorum, duo a dextra parte chori ambones visuntur, alter versus altare pro Epistola legenda, alter pro legendis Prophetis versus populum; tertius vero a sinistris tantisper altior, et ornatior pro Evangelio."—*Sacrarum Cæremoniarum sive Rituum Ecclesiasticorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ*, Lib. ii. Tit. i. de dominicis adventus, § 6. Romæ, 1751.

[2] Vide Hope's Historical Essay on Architecture, p. 94, quoted in *The British Magazine*, 1841. Vol. xix. pp. 343, 344.

c'est pour l'écouter que les Missels de Paris (sedentibus omnibus. *Miss. Paris.* ann. 1685, 1706, et 1738.) marquent que tout le monde est assis. Mais les evêques et les prêtres, n'entendant peut-être pas bien le soudiacre, à cause de l'éloignement du jubé, ont été bien aises de lire eux-mêmes l'Epître. C'est pourquoi les Us de Cîteaux, imprimés à Paris en 1643 et 1664, et l'Ordinaire des Guillemites en 1279, ont marqué que le prêtre pouvoit lire dans le Missel (interim sacerdos sedeat usque ad Evangelium, et in missali legere potest.—*Ordin. Miss. Guillelm. Us.*). L'Ordinaire des Jacobins en 1254, et celui des Carmes en 1514, veulent qu'après la collecte, le prêtre s'étant assis, on lui mette sur les genoux une serviette et un Missel pour y lire ce qui lui plaira." [1] "*When the Epistle is sung, the priest reads it in a low voice.* The ancient and more natural custom is that everyone listens to the subdeacon, and it is in order to hear him that the Missals of Paris point out that everyone is seated. But the bishops and priests, not perhaps hearing the subdeacon well, on account of the distance of the ambo (pulpit) were very glad to read the Epistle themselves. That is why the Use of Citeaux, printed at Paris in 1643 and 1664, and the Ordinary of the Guillemites in 1279, have pointed out that the priest might read in the Missal. The Ordinary of the Jacobins in 1254, and that of the Carmelites in 1514, direct

[1] *Explication de la Messe.* Part ii. Art v. Vol. i., p. 200.

that, after the collect, the priest having sat down, there should be placed on his knees a napkin and a Missal for him to read out of it what he pleased."

Here we find the origin of the custom, which now obtains in the Roman Church, of reading the Epistle away from the people. The Epistle being in Latin, and therefore not understood by the people, no practical good could result from their hearing it[1]: as a matter of *utility*, it was therefore found unnecessary to read it to them from the ambo or pulpit outside the choir, as had been the earlier custom. And so, whilst the reading of the Epistle to the congregation from the ambo was abandoned, the reading of it to the clergy in choir and at the altar continued, and has survived down to the present day. Thus it came to pass that the Epistle came to be regarded as the private business of the celebrant and clergy, to be performed to suit their own convenience, without reference to the presence or edification of the faithful. Possibly, in the case of the celebrant, another reason entered in. The Missal, containing the Epistles, being usually a somewhat heavy book, it would be found

[1] It is significant to observe that, in Bishop Challoner's *The Garden of the Soul*, which is probably the most popular of all Roman Catholic manuals of devotion for the laity, they are allowed to say a prayer whilst the Epistle is being read in Latin. "During the Epistle you may pray thus: *A Prayer at the Epistle*, Thou hast vouchsafed, etc."—*The Garden of the Soul*, London, 1798, p. 81, sub Devotions for Mass.

convenient to rest it upon the altar-cushion or desk. We have only to stand up with a heavy book in our hands, and proceed to read aloud, to find out the inconvenience for ourselves. If the Epistle at Low Mass was to be read from a volume placed on the altar, it would be natural to place it so that the celebrant should face East. If the reader, as at High Mass, was the subdeacon, he too would naturally adopt the celebrant's position of facing East. Secondly, as to *ecclesiastical sanction:* The custom in question being generally adopted for convenience sake, it remained for the Church to adapt herself to the practice, by giving it her sanction. This was done, as we have seen, in the rubrics of the Roman Missal, quoted above. Thirdly, as to *symbolism:* The custom of reading the Epistle to the East having been adopted for convenience sake, and established by authority, it was not unnatural to seek a symbolic meaning for it, and so to justify it in the eyes of the faithful. This symbolic reason or reasons were with some ingenuity found; as, for example, those stated by Durandus, and named above; or again, by assuming that, as the Mass is a sacrificial action, every part of the Service must perforce have the nature of an offering made to God. Probably other meanings have been attached by rubricists to the custom under review.[1]

1 "As a reason for reading Holy Scripture not facing the people, I have been told that the liturgical Epistle and

II.

Now, the process here described was natural and appropriate enough, so long as the Epistle was read in a language not understanded of the people. But when the Epistle is read in the mother-tongue, as is happily the case in the English Church, the whole fabric of induction is at once rudely shaken and overthrown; and each argument used on behalf of the process becomes immediately invalid. This we now proceed to demonstrate.

The primary purpose and sole justification of reading the Holy Scriptures in the mother-tongue is obviously that the people may understand what is read. The Epistle is read in English, in order that the faithful may hear and profit thereby. This being the case, as it undoubtedly is, it is both natural and reasonable that the reader should "turn himself as he may best be heard of all such as are present,

Gospel are acts of worship, and therefore properly read as if Almighty God Himself were being addressed. I have never met with this reason in print, and I cannot but fancy that it has been forced by the necessity of finding some explanation after the act itself had been determined upon, as so many of the so-called 'mystical' reasons are. But the Epistle and Gospel occur in the *Missa Catechuminorum*, the period of instruction and of sermon, when Eucharistic worship has not yet begun; a fact which seems to destroy the theory of the Gospel being an act of worship. In the national rites, though not at Rome, the priest and deacon sit during the Epistle, a posture which ill accords with the idea that it is an act of worship."—*Ancient Liturgical Customs now falling into Disuse.* J. W. Legg. Trans. S.P.E.S., Vol. ii. p. 125.

reading distinctly with an audible voice.[1] This direction, concerning the reading of the Lessons at Choir offices, states the principle which the English Church lays down in the case of all public reading of the Scriptures. It is both natural, reasonable, and in accordance with the declared intention of the English Church, that the reader should face his hearers and read to them for their edification. In the case of the Epistle at the Eucharist this is self-evident, since the Epistles contain a considerable amount of practical exhortation. The very word 'epistle' signifies a 'letter.' When the father of a family receives a letter from an absent son, intended for the whole household, he naturally reads it *to* them. If he was to read the letter in their presence with his face to the wall, he would be considered mad. It is thus quite as inconvenient and inappropriate for the celebrant or epistler to read the Epistle turning away from the congregation, as it would be for the preacher to turn his back on the people. In the case of the Epistle, as being a portion of inspired Scripture, there is a peculiar irreverence in the custom which we are exposing: it is not only inappropriate, inconvenient, and unreasonable; it is positively irreverent. Holy Scripture is written for our learning. A schoolmaster faces his scholars when he teaches them a lesson.

[1] *Rubric concerning the Lessons.* Book of Common Prayer.

We have already alluded briefly to the principle of the English Church in the matter of reading the Scriptures to the people. In the year 1661, the Puritans expressed their objection to the custom of saying any parts whatever of the services towards the East. The matter came up before the bishops who gave us the last revision of the Book of Common Prayer. To the rubric in the Communion Service, "Then shall the priest or the bishop (being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus;"[1] the Puritans made the following exception—"The minister turning himself to the people is most convenient throughout the whole ministration:" to which the bishops replied—"The minister's turning to the people is not most convenient throughout the whole ministration. When he speaks to them, as in Lessons, Absolution, and Benedictions,[2] it is convenient that he turn to them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did."[3] Now, this answer is very much to the point in regard to the position of the minister during the reading of the Epistle; for (1) the objection made by the Puritans was founded on a rubric

[1] *Rubric before the Absolution, Service of Holy Communion.*

[2] Incidentally, this direction prohibits the practice of the priest facing East during the recitation of the first half of the Blessing at the Eucharist.

[3] Cardwell, *Hist. of Conferences*, pp. 320, 353.

in the Communion Service, and the bishops' answer is given under the heading "The Communion Service"—their replies under the heading "Concerning Morning and Evening Prayer" being given previously. Their answer primarily applied to the Communion Service, "the whole ministration." There is no "ministration" of Morning and Evening Prayer: there is "The Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion" in the Prayer Book. (2) The order of the sentence, "Lessons, Absolution, and Benedictions," is that in which these things occur in the Communion Service, and not in the Choir offices. Moreover, there is no Benediction appointed in the latter. It is therefore highly probable that by the "Lessons," the bishops meant the liturgical Epistle and Gospel. We may safely say, at the least, that the liturgical Scriptures or Lessons are to be included within the scope of their declaration, that "when the minister speaks to the people, it is convenient that he turn to them."

III.

There is another piece of evidence in regard to the subject before us in this article, to which we will next allude. When we examine the rubrics of the Communion Service, we find no direction given as to where or how the Epistle and Gospel are to be read. We are therefore justified in looking for earlier English

precedent; and for a precedent, if one can be found, which concerns the reading of the liturgical Scriptures in English. And such a precedent exists. If we turn to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., we find the following rubric, following the direction for the reading of the lessons at Morning Prayer: "And, to the end the people may the better hear, in such places where they do sing, there shall the lessons be sung in a plain tune, after the manner of distinct reading: and likewise the Epistle and Gospel." This rubric occurs in the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1559. It is to be observed, that it follows the direction for the first and second lessons to be read "distinctly with a loud voice, that the people may hear, by the minister standing and turning him so as he may best be heard of all such as be present." From the following direction as to the Epistle and Gospel being sung "after the manner of distinct reading, to the end the people may the better hear," it is to be inferred that, in reading these liturgical Scriptures, the minister is also to "turn him so as he may best be heard of all such as be present."

That this actually was the position intended, is proved by King Edward VI.'s Injunctions of 1547, which were still in force and had established the precedent followed in 1549, when the First Prayer Book was imposed. The 21st injunction runs thus: "In the time of

high mass within every church, he that saith or singeth the same, shall read or cause to be read the Epistle and Gospel of that mass in English and not in Latin, in the pulpit, or in such convenient place as the people may hear the same. And also every Sunday and holy-day they shall plainly and distinctly read, or cause to be read, one chapter of the New Testament in English, in the said place at Mattins immediately after the lessons; and at Even-song, after *Magnificat*, one chapter from the Old Testament."[1] Upon this, it is to be observed, (1) that from the beginning of the reading of the Epistle in English, it was ordered to be read towards the people "in the pulpit, or in such convenient place as the people may hear the same." This was the custom inherited and already binding when the First Prayer Book appeared: and there has been no subsequent authorization of any other direction up to the present day.[2] (2) The injunction

[1] Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, Vol. i. pp. 13, 14.

Probably, if not certainly, as a result of the Injunctions of 1547, quoted above, we find that there was made at St. Margaret's, Westminster, in that year a "stone in the body of the church, for the priest to declare the 'Pistells and Gospells."—*Illustrations of the Manners and Expences of Antient Times in England*, Lond. Nicholls, 1797, p. 12. See Note at the conclusion of this article.

[2] In 1561, we find Bishop Parkhurst, of Norwich, enquiring, "Whether the lessons, epistels and gospels be redde or songe so as they may be plainli harde of the people."—*Rit. Com.* Second Report. p. 401.

In Archbishop Grindal's Injunctions for the Laity, given at York in 1571, we find,—"The prayers and other service

quoted connects the reading of the liturgical Scriptures and that of the lessons at Choir offices in such wise, that the directions concerning the former hold good in principle in the case of the latter, and vice versâ. Thus we may fairly say, that the absence of any direction in our present Prayer Book for the posture or position of the reader during the reading of the Epistle and Gospel, is reasonably to be supplied from analogy, by consulting the explicit directions given in that Book for the posture or position of the reader of the lessons at the Choir offices.

We claim to have established very completely that the appeal to principle, to authority, and to precedent, gives one and the same result, namely, that the Epistle (and the Gospel) is to be read by the minister towards the people; and that, as a consequence, there is not a particle of evidence to be produced that it is intended that the Epistle (or the Gospel) should be read facing East. We can only say, in regard to the latter method, "we have no such custom." The evidence, in fact, the other way is so complete, that any resort to modern foreign usage as a model is as unnecessary, as it is

appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion be said and done at the communion table, except the Epistle and Gospel, which shall be read in the pulpit or stall."—*Remains*, p. 132. Parker Soc.

on many accounts disallowed. We can only marvel that, with such ample materials at hand, anyone can have doubted for a moment what our Church intends in this matter.

NOTE I.—As an example of the foreign custom, which is quite common, of reading the Epistle and the Gospel at High Mass to the people in the vernacular, from the pulpit, before the sermon, the following may serve. This reading however is not liturgical; and it goes to prove that the reading of Holy Scripture during the celebration of the Eucharist is not an act of worship.

Strasbourg. *Manuale seu Compendium Ritualis Argentinensis . . . jussu . . . Armandi Gastonis S.R.E. Cardinalis De Rohan . . .* Ed. secunda, Argentinae, 1780. p. 320.

De Pronao. "Singulis diebus Dominicis et Festis, saltem solemnibus, in unaquaque Ecclesia Parochiali . . . haberi debet concio, aut sermo familiaris de lege divina, vel ante, vel intra Missam Parochialem, pro cujusque loci consuetudine.

"Si fiat intra Missam, Parochus, immediate post Evangelium, deponet Casulam et Manipulum super Altare in cornu Epistolae, pulpitum seu cathedram conscendet, et facto super se signo crucis, dicens vernacula lingua: *In nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti. Amen.* Leget Epistolam Missae diei lingua vulgari, hoc sequenti admonitione praemissa:

"Voici, Mes Freres, l'Épître de la Messe de ce jour, que je vais vous lire. Elle est tirée du . . .

"Hic notabit Librum & caput Scripturae sacrae, unde desumpta est Epistola, quam simul atque legerit, dicet:

"Je vais aussi vous lire l'Evangile. Il est tiré du . . .

The following is a translation of the foregoing:

"Every Sunday and Festival, at least every solemn Festival, in every Parish Church . . . there ought to be a Sermon, or a plain discourse about the divine law, either before or during the Parish Mass, according to the custom of each place.

"If it take place during the Mass, the Curate, immediately after the Gospel, shall lay down his Chasuble and Maniple on the Epistle-horn of the Altar, and going up into the pulpit or reading desk [?], shall make the sign of the cross upon himself, saying in the vulgar tongue: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. He will read the Epistle of the Mass of the day in the vulgar tongue, having first said as follows:

"This, My Brethren, is the Epistle of the Mass of the day, which I am about to read to you. It is taken from . . .

"Here he will specify the Book and chapter of Holy Scripture, from which the Epistle is taken, and as soon as he has read it he will say:

"I am also about to read the Gospel to you. It is taken from . . ."

NOTE II.—In reference to the ambones in the church of St. Clement, Rome (p. 60), the following extract from *The British Magazine*, 1841, Vol. xix p. 344, is interesting: "At St. Clement's, according to Ciampini, the *Gospel* was read by a deacon, who turned towards the adjoining aisle when the *men* of the congregation were few in number, and all collected in that part, but in the opposite direction when the church was fully occupied. On the opposite side of the choir, near the women's aisle, we perceive a staircase between two platforms, of which that towards the altar is a pulpit, enclosed on three sides, for reading the *Epistle*; the other has, at the opposite end, an open desk, supported by a small pillar, for the *Graduale* (a short anthem sung between the Epistle and Gospel). On this, Ciampini remarks that, however the church might stand with respect to the cardinal points, the *Epistle* must be read *towards the altar*. He assigns no reason for this custom, which would now-a-days seem strange, but must have been perfectly appropriate when an epistle was really an address to the Church assembled, from some absent apostle or bishop. The reader would then, of course, direct his voice towards the clergy who sat behind the altar, and the principal laymen and women whose places were near the sides of it."

NOTE III.—In the Notes on the Book of Common Prayer attributed to Bishop Andrewes (who died in the year 1626), we find the following: "*Immediately after the Collect, the Priest shall read the Epistle.* Here the other priest, or if

there be none, he that executeth, descendeth to the door, adoreth, and then turning readeth the Epistle and Gospel." —Andrewes' *Minor Works*, p. 152. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.

Amongst the alterations in the Prayer Book suggested by Bishop Cosin in 1661, we read—"Immediately after the Collects, the priest or one appointed, shall turn to the people and read the Epistle."—Cosin's *Works*, Vol. V. p. 513. note. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.

The Posture of the Hearers of the Liturgical Epistle.

No direction given in the Prayer Book as to the posture of the faithful at the Epistle, p. 77. The mistake of consulting modern Roman usage, pp. 77, 78. Kneeling during the reading of the Epistle not medieval, p. 78. Testimony of Belethus, and Durandus, pp. 79, 80. Custom at Lincoln in 1236, p. 80. Sitting for the Epistle, the custom at Rome in 1516, p. 81. Testimony of Bp. Hooper in 1551, pp. 81—83. Later testimonies, pp. 83—86. An argument against kneeling for the Epistle drawn from the direction to stand for the Gospel, pp. 86, 87. Kneeling for the Epistle an abuse, pp. 87, 88. *Appendix* 1., Evidence of the Roman *Ordines* and the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* in favour of sitting for the Epistle, pp. 89—92; other similar evidence, pp. 92—94. *Appendix* 2., Witness of the old ritualists against kneeling for the Epistle, pp. 95—98.

IV.

THE POSTURE OF THE HEARERS OF THE LITURGICAL EPISTLE.

IN the previous article we made some remarks upon the position of the reader of the Epistle at the Eucharist. We came to the conclusion that the proper position to be adopted is undoubtedly that in which the reader faces the people, and so that he may be best heard by them. We now pass on, in the present article, to consider what is the proper posture to be adopted by the lay-people during the reading of the Epistle. Whilst it is expressly ordered by the rubric of the Book of Common Prayer that they should stand to hear the Gospel, no direction whatever is given as to the posture to be adopted whilst they hear the Epistle. We must therefore look elsewhere for guidance.

I.

Some persons, about fifty years ago or less, feeling the need of direction upon this point, apparently adopted the rough and ready method of consulting the usage of the modern Roman Church in this matter, and of taking that usage as their model. The result of this unauthorised appeal is seen in many of our

English churches in the present day—the laity kneel for the Epistle; or, to speak more correctly, they remain kneeling whilst it is being read. Kneeling during the reading of the Epistle is the continental custom at Low Masses, according to the directions of the rubrics of the Roman Missal, which order that at Low Mass the assistants shall kneel all the time, except during the Gospel.[1] It is to be remembered that the ceremonies of Low Mass in the Roman Church, compared with those of High Mass, are modern: they have been greatly influenced by the inability of the people to follow the Latin service. In the matter before us, this is conspicuously the case, for the custom of kneeling during the reading of the Epistle is not medieval. Pelliccia tells us, that from the eighth, and especially since the ninth century, in the

1 "Circumstantes autem in Missis privatis semper genua flectunt, etiam tempore Paschali, præterquam dum legitur Evangelium."—Rubr. Gen. Missalis. xvii. 2.

The posture of the Roman Catholic laity during the Epistle is described as follows in *Catholic Customs, a Guide for the Laity in England*, pp. 63 ff., (Catholic Truth Soc. London. 1900). "At the beginning of High Mass all kneel until the *Gloria* has been said by the celebrant. When he sits, the congregation sits. When the choir has finished the *Gloria*, the celebrant rises and goes to the altar to sing the prayers for the day. . . . If you have been sitting down during the prayers, you remain sitting throughout the Epistle, until the beginning of the Gospel. If, however, you were standing during the prayers, you sit as soon as the priest begins the Epistle. At Low Mass, you kneel when the priest begins Mass, and remain kneeling until the beginning of the Gospel."

Western Church, it was the custom both for the celebrant and the other ministers, and also for the congregation, to sit down after the collect; and that this custom was kept up almost to the fourteenth century.[1]

This conclusion is strengthened by a reference to Belethus, who flourished at the close of the twelfth century, who says, "Epistola Pauli deinde legitur, ad quam genua non flectimus, quoniam ad novum pertinet testamentum."[2] "An Epistle of Paul is then read, at which we do not kneel, since it belongs to the New Testament." Durandus, writing some three hundred years before the conclusion of the period known as the Middle Ages, and following Belethus, said, "Cum autem dicitur Epistola genua non flectimus, cum ad novum pertineat testamentum, immo sedemus, quia doctrina in quiete et silentio audienda est. Usus etiam sedendi a veteri testamento assumitur, sicut in Esdra legitur."[3] "Now when the Epistle is read we do not kneel, seeing that it belongs to the New Testament; but we sit, because teaching should be listened to in quietness and silence. Indeed the custom of sitting is taken from the Old Testament, as we read in Esdras" (Ezra x. 9. *All the people*

[1] *The Polity of the Christian Church.* Trans. Bellett. p. 232. For authorities for this statement, see Appendices I. and II. of this essay.

[2] Belethus, *Rationale Div. Offic.* cap. cxxxiv. de institutione jejuniorum Quatuor Temporum.

[3] Durandus, *Rationale*, lib. iv. cap. 16.

sat in the street of the house of God: and Ezra the priest stood up, and said unto them . . .). Durandus goes on to say: "Milites tamen stare consueverunt quando Epistolæ Pauli leguntur, in honore ejus, quia miles fuit. Unde in signum militiæ suæ depingitur cum ense in manu, vel ideo quia ipse suam prædicationem Evangelium nominavit."[1] "Nevertheless, when the Epistles of Paul are read, soldiers are accustomed to stand in honour of him, because he was a soldier. Hence, as a sign of his warfare, he is painted with a sword in his hand, or else because he himself spoke of preaching the Gospel as warfare."

At Lincoln, in the year 1236, in the same century as that in which Durandus wrote his *Rationale*,[2] it was the custom to sit during the reading of the Epistle: "Ad missam eciam sedetur dum lecciones et epistole leguntur."[3] "At Mass also people sit while lessons and epistles are read." At Sarum the clerks sat during the Epistle: "Notandum est, quod omnes clerici stare tenentur ad missam, nisi dum lectio Epistolæ legitur."[4] "It is to be noted that all the clergy are bound to stand at Mass, except while the lection from the Epistle is being read."[5] It is not unnatural to suppose

[1] *Rationale*, lib. iv. cap. 16. [2] Durandus died A.D. 1296.
[3] *Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, H. Bradshaw and Chr. Wordsworth, Vol. ii. p. 152. § 26.
[4] *Missale Sarum*, Dickinson, col. 586. See also *The Use of Sarum*, Frere, p. 293.
[5] A similar order is found at Aberdeen in the 15th century.

that the people followed their example, at least such of them as were able to follow the Latin service.

In the year 1516, Christopher Marcellus' *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum, sive Sacrarum Cœremoniarum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ*, was published. In Marcellus' treatise, the following passage occurs, showing the custom of the Roman Church at the beginning of the sixteenth century. "Celebrante dicente ultimam orationem, subdiaconus, deposita planeta, accipit librum Epistolarum . . . ipse sibi librum tenens, dicit Epistolam, omnibus sedentibus." [1] "While the celebrant says the last collect, the subdeacon removes his chasuble, and takes the book of the Epistles. . . holding the book for himself, he says the Epistle, all sitting meanwhile." [2]

In the year 1551, Bishop Hooper, in his Injunctions, enquired, "Whether they" (the clergy) "suffer or cause the people to sit at the

[1] Lib. ii. cap. ii. fol. lxx. Venice, 1516.

[2] Catalani, in his learned commentary on the *Sacrarum Cœremoniarum* of Marcellus observes, on the above passage: "Atque hæc antiqua est consuetudo, cujus meminit Honorius Augustodunensis, lib. i. cap. xiv., ubi sedendum scribit, dum subdiaconus Epistolam legit; quod affirmant etiam Rupertus Abbas Tuitiensis, lib. i. cap. xxxii. Hugo Victorinus, lib. ii. *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, cap. xvii. et alii."—Catalani, *Sacrarum Cœremoniarum sive Rituum Ecclesiasticorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ.* Tom. ii. Lib. ii. Tit. i. de dominicis adventus, cap. ii. §. 6. Romæ, 1751. The passages from the old ritualists, referred to by Catalani, will be found, with translations, in Appendix II. of this essay.

Epistle, and to stand at the Gospel, and so use them both now as superstitiously as they did in the time of their massing."[1] In order to understand Hooper's meaning, we must refer back to a previous enquiry in the same set of Injunctions: "Whether they" (the clergy) "sit at one part of their service, kneel at another, and stand at another, as they were wont to sit when they sang the psalms, kneel at *Kyrie-eleyson*, and stand up at *Magnificat*, *Te Deum laudamus*, and *Benedictus;* the which alterance of their gesture caused the people to think that the hearing of the service were sufficient."[2] Hooper is evidently discouraging the attaching of any importance to postures, as we should naturally expect of him, and, as it seems, the change of posture for the Gospel. But what gives his first question considerable interest is, that it relates to the old usage in vogue, in reference to the posture of the hearers of the Epistle, at the time when the Latin Mass was celebrated. His enquiry affords good and reliable testimony as to what the medieval practice was, both at High and at Low Mass. The first of the enquiries quoted above, "do the clergy suffer or cause the people to sit at the Epistle, . . . as they did in the time of their massing," affords evidence of great value that, up to the Reformation, the

[1] *Later Writings of Bishop Hooper*, p. 146, § xxvii. Parker Soc.

[2] Ibid. p. 145, § xviii.

faithful sat for the Epistle. Hooper's Injunctions are mainly taken up with questions concerning the continuance of the old customs common under the Latin rite. If it had been the custom before the Reformation for the people to kneel for the Epistle, Hooper would almost certainly have said so. It is to be observed that Hooper issued these Injunctions in 1551, the fifth year of the reign of Edward VI. From their comparatively late date, we may reasonably conclude that the practice of sitting for the Epistle was continued under the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., and was not unusual, to say the least, in 1551.

In *De Cœremoniis Cardinalium, Paridis Crassi Bononiensis*, printed at Rome in the year 1564, sub de Epistola, we read, "Et mox Epistolari libro deposito, Missali vero sumpto, solus stans, sedentibus omnibus capellanis ministris, illum tenet, quo ad Card. Episcopus legerit Epistolam."[1] "And immediately, having laid down the book of Epistles, and having taken up the Missal, (the deacon) alone standing, whilst all the chaplains who minister sit, he holds it whilst the Cardinal-Bishop shall read the Epistle."[2]

J. S. Durantus, writing at the close of the sixteenth century, says that the people sat for the Epistle. In his *De Ritibus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ*,[3]

[1] lib. i. cap. xxxviii. fol. 32. Venetiis, 1582.
[2] pp. 61, 62, of previous essay.
[3] Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1592.

we find in the table of contents, at the head of cap. xviii. in lib. 2., "Epistola dum legitur, sedet episcopus, sedent ministri, sedet et populus." Then in the text, page 396, we have, "8. Porro, dum legitur epistola, sedet episcopus, sedent et ministri." "While the Epistle is being read, the bishop sits, the ministers sit, and the people sit. . . . Moreover, while the Epistle is being read, the bishop sits, and the ministers sit."[1] Hospinianus, writing in 1598, and referring to Durandus' *Rationale*, says, "Audit autem populus Epistolam sedendo."[2] "But the people hear the Epistle sitting."

In the year 1641, we have the following evidence, "They (the Church party) tell us, that when the Epistle cometh, all may sit down, but when the Gospel beginneth, all must again rise; during the time of sermon all must stand discovered (uncovered)."[3] In Queen Anne's time (1701-1714) we have evidence that sitting for the Epistle was the rule. "The Epistle is read; at which the people are allowed to sit, to make the service

[1] Durantus adds references to Amalarius Fortunatus, lib. 3, *de Ecclesiast. Offic.* cap. 10; Innocent iii. lib. 2, *Mysteriorum Missæ*, cap. 33; Durandus, *Rationale*, lib. 4. cap. 18, Sedere solet et populus; Rupert. lib. i. cap. 32. These passages are given with translations in Appendix II. of this essay.

[2] *Historiæ Sacramentariæ*, lib. iii. cap. iii. § 14. de Epistola. Genevæ, 1681.

[3] *A Large Supplement, etc.*, p. 88. qu. in Hierurgia Anglicana, pp. 367, 368. London, 1848.

the less uneasy."[1] Dr. Nicholls, writing in the year 1708, and commenting upon the words of Durandus, previously quoted,[2] says, "It has been an ancient custom for the congregation to sit to repose themselves during the reading of the Epistle."[3] Dr. Bisse, in 1716, says, "There have been two peculiar honours paid to the Gospels, which continue in our Church to this day. The first is, that all the congregation stand up at the reading of them, as being the word of the Master; whereas, at the reading of the Epistles, they are indulged the posture of sitting, as being the words of the servants. . . ."[4] In 1798, we have, "During the reading of the Epistle, the people are tacitly enjoined to sit."[5] Bishop Mant, in 1820, quotes Dr. Bisse's words, showing that the custom of sitting during the hearing of the Epistle was in vogue a century later.[6] We have here evidence of the practice of sitting

[1] *A Persuasive to the People of Scotland in order to remove their prejudice to the Book of Common Prayer*, by P. Barclay, A.M. 2nd ed. London, 1723, p. 112. This book was written in Queen Anne's reign; and the 1st ed. was published in 1713.

[2] See p. 80.

[3] *A Comment on the Book of Common Prayer*, sub Rubric for the Epistle.

[4] *The Beauty of Holiness*, 7th ed. Serm. iv. p. 140. Lond. 1720. See Appendix II. p. 97, of this essay.

[5] *A critical and practical elucidation of the Book of Common Prayer*, by the late John Shepherd, M.A., Minister of Pattiswicke, Essex, 4th ed., Vol. ii. p. 176. London, 1828.

[6] *On the Book of Common Prayer*, 2nd ed. Oxford, 1822. p. 334, note.

to hear the liturgical Epistle, in England, down to the beginning of the last century.

II.

An argument against kneeling for the Epistle may be drawn from the direction to stand for the Gospel, which bears upon this matter. This direction is intended to show greater reverence for the Gospel than for the Epistle. But since kneeling is with us a posture of greater reverence than standing, it follows that the posture for the Epistle is that of sitting. To kneel for the Epistle, and but to stand for the Gospel, is to reverse the intention of the rubric, by expressing greater reverence for the former than for the latter. There is a somewhat remarkable question which occurs in Bishop Montagu's Visitation Articles of 1638,[1] which sheds some light upon the subject under consideration: he asks, "Do your parishioners stand also at the reading of the Gospel, and bend or bow at the glorious, sacred, and sweet name of Jesus, pronounced out of the Gospel read?" Why bow when the Holy Name occurs in the Gospel, and not in the Epistle? The answer seems to be satisfactorily given from the fact, that persons sitting down are not in the convenient posture for bowing. That this is the right interpretation, may be inferred from Bishop Andrewes' *Notes on the Book of*

[1] Tit. v. 14. Vide Appendix E. Second Report of the Royal Commission on Ritual, p. 582.

Common Prayer:[1] "In reading the holy Gospel, and never else, is adoration made at the Name of Jesus; for then only is it in its right exaltation; and then men stand in a posture ready to make reverence."

From *The Lay Folks Mass Book*,[2] however, which dates from the thirteenth century, or thereabouts, we find that some of the people knelt and said *Pater nosters* all through the Collects and Epistle.

> Knele doun on thy knese sone;
> If thai singe messe, or if thai saie,
> Thi pater-noster reherce al-waie,
> Till deken or prest tho gospel rede.

Here we have evidence of the fact that, in defiance of directions to the contrary and early medieval usage, such as we have just quoted, the habit of kneeling was becoming the custom in England. But it is to be observed that it was a habit practised by such persons as could not follow the Latin service, and who filled up the time with their own private devotions. This is evident from a reference to Texts C., and F., of *The Lay Folks Mass Book*, which direct such persons as can read, to follow the Latin office, collect, and epistle; and such persons as cannot read, to say *Pater nosters*.[3] That such kneeling at the Epistle was an abuse in the thirteenth century, is quite obvious, as a con-

[1] *Minor Works*, p. 152. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.
[2] E. E. T. S., p. 16. Text B. lines 150, ff.
[3] pp. 14–17, Texts C.. and F., at foot.

sideration of the facts stated above goes far to prove. That it is an abuse in the English Church, now that people can follow the reading of the Epistle, is self-evident. Kneeling at any time is the posture of adoration and petition, the posture natural to us in modern times in addressing God, and not in receiving instruction. The posture to be adopted during instruction from the Scriptures and in other ways, is either that of standing or that of sitting. But since, as we have said, standing during the reading of the Scriptures at the Eucharist is ordered in our Prayer Book only for the Holy Gospel, it remains that the appropriate posture for the laity during the reading of the Epistle is that of sitting. For the kneeling posture at such a time, there is nothing whatever to be said on the score of utility, authority, or symbolism.

APPENDIX I.

IN the old Roman *Ordines* (which date from the early part of the eighth century, and which are printed in Mabillon's *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. Paris. 1689), and in the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* (which first appeared in 1600), whilst there is no allusion to any kneeling for the Epistle, a great point is made of the bishop and presbyters sitting after the Collect, whilst the sub-deacon who reads the Epistle, and the deacons stand. This will be seen from the following quotations:

"Deinde in missa non sedebat pontifex ante absolutam orationem, quæ Epistolæ præmittitur: eoque sedente ac annuente, episcopi et presbyteri sedebant, non vero diaconi aut sub-diaconi, aliive ministri. Huc spectat Hieronymi ad Evagrium, epistola lxxxv. *Ceterum etiam in ecclesia Romæ presbyteri sedent, et stant diaconi.* . . . Si vulgato de Romanis Pontificibus libro fides est, Anastasius Papa I. constituit, *ut quotiescumque sancta Evangelia recitarentur, sacerdotes non sederent, sed curvi starent.*" The above quotation has regard to the ceremonial of the mass surrounding the Epistle and Gospel: the inference from the last sentence is, that the priests were sitting before the Gospel.—*Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii., In Ordinem Romanum Commentarius; *Singulares ritus Missæ pontificalis secundum Ordinem Romanum, et primo ab initio ad Canonem*, iii. pp. xli., xlii.

"Then the Pope used not to sit down during the Mass until the end of the collect which precedes the Epistle: when he sat down and, with his consent, the bishops and priests used to sit, but not the deacons and sub-deacons, or the other ministers. This is referred to in the letter of Jerome to Evagrius, 85. *But also in the church of Rome the priests sit, and the deacons stand.* . . . If the book published about the Roman popes is to be trusted, Pope Anastasius I. ordered, *that as often as the holy Gospels are recited, the priests should not sit, but stand with head and shoulders inclined.*"

"Post hoc dirigens se iterum ad populum dicens, *Pax Vobiscum* . . . dicit, *Oremus*, et sequitur oratio: post finitam sedet; similiter episcopi vel presbyteri sedent."—*Ordo Romanus* i. § 9. Ibid. p. 9.

"After this, again turning to the people and saying, *Pax Vobiscum* . . . he says, *Oremus*, and the collect follows: after it is finished he sits; likewise the bishops or priests sit."

To this passage Mabillon adds a footnote: "Idem auctor (Amalarius) in lib. iii., cap. v., sub initium, tradit morem inolevisse, *ut non sedeatur in ecclesia* ante finem hujus orationis."

"The same author (Amalarius) in book iii., chapter 5, at the beginning, tells us that the custom grew up of not sitting in church before the end of this collect."

"Post primum autem datam orationem, Pontifex sedet versus ad populum, et presbyteri cum eo ad nutum ejus, et diaconi stant ante Pontificem. Subdiaconi autem ascendunt ad altare, statuentes se ad dexteram, sive sinistram. Subdiaconus vero qui lecturus est . . . ascendit in ambonem ut legat."—*Ordo Romanus* ii. §§ 6. 7. Ibid. pp. 44, 45.

"Now after the end of the first collect, the Pope sits facing the people, and the priests sit with him at a sign from him, and the deacons stand before the Pope. But the subdeacons go up to the altar and arrange themselves on the right or left. The subdeacon, however, who is to read [the Epistle] . . . goes up into the ambo to read [it]."

"Pontifex incipit, *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, si tempus fuerit. Sedere autem non oportet Pontificem, antequam dicant, *Amen*, post priman orationem. . . . Sed ille subdiaconus, qui lecturus est, postquam viderit episcopos sive presbyteros post Pontificem sedere, quos ipse Pontifex nutu suo facit secum considere, tunc ascendit in ambonem, et legit lectionem."—*Ordo Romanus* iii. § 9. Ibid. p. 56.

"The Pope begins, *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, if the season requires it. But the Pope ought not to sit before they say *Amen*, after the first collect . . . but the subdeacon, who is about to read, after he sees the bishops or priests sit down after the Pope, who have been directed by a sign from the Pope himself to sit with him, then goes up into the ambo, and reads the lesson."

"Et *Gloria in excelsis Deo* percelebrata, dicatur a Pontifice, ut mos est, oratio: sedensque ipse annuat presbyteris ut sedeant. *Ordo Romanus* v. § 7. Ibid. p. 66.

"And when *Gloria in excelsis Deo* has been said, let the collect be said by the Pope, as the custom is: and let him sit down and make a sign to the priests that they may sit."

"Cumque collectam finierit, lectio legatur. Et sedente episcopo. . . ."—*Ordo Romanus* vi. § 5. Ibid. p. 72.

"And when he has finished the collect, let the lesson be read. And the bishop sitting down. . . ."

"Dictis orationibus, Pontifex resideat, subdiaconus vero dum Pontifex dicit orationem seu orationes, tempore opportuno vadit cum libro Epistolarum ad locum in quo Epistola legenda est. . . . Dictis orationibus, [sacerdos] sedeat usque ad Evangelium."—*Ordo Romanus* xiv. 53, 61. Ibid. pp. 298. 316.

"When the collects have been said the Pope sits down; while the Pope says the collect or collects, the subdeacon at the proper time goes with the book of Epistles to the place in which the Epistle is to be read. . . . When the collects have been said, let [the priest] sit until the Gospel."

"Cum episcopus dicit conclusionem ultimæ orationis, . . . Sedet deinde episcopus, sedentibus omnibus. Subdiaconus autem accipiens librum . . . extra presbyterium a latere sinistro altaris, vel, ubi ita consuetum sit, in ambone cantat Epistolam alta voce."—*Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, lib. ii., cap viii., de Missa Solemni, Episcopo celebrante. Paris, 1633. p. 201.

"When the bishop says the conclusion of the last collect. . . . Then the bishop sits, and all sit. But the subdeacon, taking the book . . . sings the Epistle on a high note in an ambo outside the presbytery on the left side of the altar, or wherever it is customary to do it."

The *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* has the force of law in the Roman Church, and whilst binding primarily in cathedral and collegiate churches, is binding secondarily, but equally, as regards all matters which concern them, in all churches whatsoever which are not exempted by the Pope. (See *The Month*, May, 1896. pp. 115, 116.) From a reference to L'Abbé Falise's *Sacrarum Rituum Rubricarumque Missalis Breviarii et Ritualis Romani*, 3rd ed., 1863, pp. 154, 155, 296, 297, it is clear that, at high mass, all the ministers of the altar stand for the Epistle, but not the choir, who sit; and that at a pontifical high mass, all sit, except the subdeacon who sings the Epistle. In several respects, the Roman pontifical high mass retains much older ceremonies than the ordinary high mass.

In the *Appendix I. Ordinis Romani*, printed in Mabillon's *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. p. 552, we find a comment on the words of Amalarius quoted in Appendix II. of this essay, as follows: "*De sessione episcopi.* Quod requiem animarum

significet post actam orationem: et quid significet quod presbyteri cum eo sedent: et de eo quod versus sit ad populum: ostendit datam esse illi potestatem eorum acta scrutari. Episcopus quidem post primam orationem, quam precationem nominamus, sedet versus ad populum, et presbyteri cum eo. In ipsa vero precatione optationem bonam Ecclesiæ intelligimus, quasi dicat populo, Optavi bonum Ecclesiæ; et ideo sedeo. Et vos quidem si delectat requiem possidere animarum, quærite primum regnum Dei, et justitiam ejus, et ad æterna necessaria adjicientur vobis, et post invenietis requiem. Stare namque est a Deo in certamine posito et orare: post victoriam vero sedere ac judicare. Sedent et prestyteri cum eo. . . ."

"*On the sitting of the bishop.* That it signifies the rest of souls after prayer: and what it signifies that the priests sit with him: and about the fact that he sits facing the people: it shows that power is given him to examine their acts. The bishop, indeed, after the first collect which we name *precatio*, sits facing the people, and the priests sit with him. Now in the same prayer we understand the wish for the good of the Church, as if he were to say to the people, 'I have desired good for the Church; and therefore I sit. And you, indeed, if you wish to have rest for your souls, seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and those things which are for eternal life shall be added unto you, and afterwards ye shall find rest. For now you have to stand in the midst of the contest and to pray; but after victory to sit and judge.' The priests also sit with him."

Missale S. O. Cartusiensi. 1679.

Feria Sexta in Parasceve. ". . . *Celebrans confessionem facit, . . . deinde sessum vadit, sedetque tunc Conventus. Postea sequitur Lectio. . . .* In tribulatione sua."—p. 152.

Sabbato Sancto. ". . . *duabus candelis accensis, præcedit confessio: & Sacerdos facta oratione, & osculato altari more solito, sessum vadit, & nos pariter sedemus. Statimque sequuntur Lectiones. . . .*"—p. 168.

"The celebrant makes the confession . . . then he goes to sit down, and the convent sits at the same time. Afterwards follows the Lesson. . . . *In tribulatione sua.*"

". . . two candles having been lighted, the confession is first made: and the Priest, having said the prayer and kissed the altar in the accustomed manner, goes to sit down,

and we [i.e. the convent] likewise sit. The Lessons follow immediately."

Missale Romano-Lugdunense, 1868. (In use at the present day.)

Feria vi. in Parasceve. "Celebrans, facta altari inclinatione, vadit cum Diacono, et si sit Pontifex etiam cum suis assistentibus superpelliceo indutis, ad sedem suam. Et omnibus sedentibus, Subdiaconus cantat in loco, ubi legitur Epistola, Prophetiam sequentem."—p. 149.

"The celebrant, having made an inclination to the altar, goes with the Deacon, and if he be a Bishop, also with his assistants vested in the surplice, to his seat. And the Subdeacon sings the following Prophecy in the place where the Epistle is read, all sitting."

Sabbato Sancto. "incipitur Officium per primam Lectionem, sedente interim Celebrante cum Ministris ad latus Altaris; sedentibus pariter omnibus in Choro ad Lectiones, et Tractus, et stantibus ad Orationes."—p. 161.

"the Service is begun with the first Lesson, the Celebrant meanwhile sitting with his Ministers at the side of the Altar; all in choir likewise sitting at the Lessons and Tracts, and standing at the Collects."

Ritus in Missa in Solemni servandus. Cap. III. p. 70.*

"§ 15. In Semiduplicibus et supra, Feriisque majoribus, legitur Epistola in secundo vel tertio e superioribus stallis, a parte Epistolæ, prope januam Chori; reliquis diebus, in ejusdem Chori medio."

"§ 18. Procedente ad sedem suam Celebrante, ad suas quoque pergunt Induti et alii Ministri, prius genuflectentes.

"§ 19. Dicto Amen post ultimam Collectam, Subdiaconus sedens in erecto stallo, distincta et elevata voce cantat Epistolam, sedentibus omnibus."

"§ 15. On Semidoubles and feasts of greater dignity and on greater Ferias, the Epistle is read in the second or third of the upper stalls, on the Epistle side, near the door of the Choir; on other days in the middle of the Choir."

"§ 18. When the Celebrant goes to his seat, the vested and the other Ministers also go to their seats, first genuflecting.

"§ 19. The *Amen* after the last Collect having been said, the Sub-deacon sitting in an upright stall [?], sings the Epistle with a clear and high voice, all sitting."

Ceremoniale Parisiense. 1703.

Pars III. Cap. II. *De Missa festorum annualium.* Art. V.

"Subdiaconus . . . procedit ad ambonem, vel ad aquilam, aut alium chori locum, unde commode ab omnibus audiri possit. . . . Ubi sunt duo ambones, legit in eo qui est ad partem septentrionalem. . . . Dicta collecta, subdiaconus, nudo capite etiam hyeme, versa facie ad altare, . . . clara et distincta voce cantat epistolam, sedentibus and audientibus omnibus."—pp. 82, 83.

"The subdeacon . . . goes to the ambo or to the eagle, or other part of the choir, whence he can be conveniently heard by all. . . . Where there are two ambones, he reads in that which is on the north side. . . . The collect being said, the subdeacon, his head uncovered even in winter, and his face turned towards the altar . . . with a clear and distinct voice sings the epistle, while all sit and listen."

Good Friday at Paris (*Cer. Parisiense.* 1703. Pars IV. Cap. XIII. Art. II. § 4). "Ad lectiones et tractus, sedent omnes, et ad orationes stant." "All sit at the lessons and tracts, and stand at the collects." Same on Easter Eve.

The rubrics of the Toulouse Missal of 1832 are to the same effect as these Paris directions; and the same may be said of other French churches.

APPENDIX. II.

AMALARIUS Fortunatus. *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, lib. iii., cap. 10. (Hittorpius, Paris, 1610. col. 406.) *De Sessione Episcopi. Cap. 10.*

"Deinde Christus ascendit in coelum, ut sedeat ad dexteram Patris. Episcopus, quia vicarius est Christi in omnibus memoratis superius, debet et hic ad memoriam nobis inthronizare Christi ascensionem et sedem. Quapropter ascendit in sedem post opus et laborem ministerii commissi. Christus disposito curru suo per convenientia loca, id est, presbyteros in suo ordine, diaconos in suo, subdiaconos in suo, cæterosque gradus in suis, necnon et auditores, unumquemque in suo ascendit ad sedem, et sedet. Sedent cum eo quibus promisit: Cum sederit filius hominis in sede majestatis suae, sedebitis et vos super sedes duodecim, judicantes duodecim tribus Israel. De quibus dicit Paulus Apostolus ad Ephesios: Et conresuscitavit et consedere fecit in caelestibus in Christo Jesu. De his qui ascenderunt secum, aliqui sedent, et aliqui stant. Per eos qui sedent, demonstrantur membra Christi in pace quiescentia: per eos qui stant, in certamine posita. Caput et membra unum corpus: quomodo Christus in aliquibus sedet, in aliquibus stat (ut illum vidit Stephanus in certamine positus), aliqui ascendentium sedent aliqui stant."

"Then Christ ascended into heaven, that He might sit on the right hand of the Father. The bishop, because he represents Christ in all things mentioned above, ought here also to bring to our memory the ascension and session of Christ. Wherefore he goes up to His seat, after the work and labour of the ministry which He has fulfilled. Christ having arranged that His chariot should pass through suitable places [Lit. his chariot being arranged through suitable places], that is, that the priests [should be] in their order, the deacons in theirs, the subdeacons in theirs, and the other grades in theirs, as well as the people [*auditores*] in theirs, each in his own order,—ascends into His seat, and sits. They sit with Him to whom He made the promise: 'When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' Of whom Paul the Apostle [in the Epistle] to the

Ephesians says: 'And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together, in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.' Of those who accompany the bishop, some sit, some stand. By those who sit are signified the members of Christ resting in peace; by those who stand [are signified] they who are in the midst of the contest. The head and the members are one body: even as Christ sits in some and stands in others (as Stephen saw Him at the time of his martyrdom), so some of those who go up [with the bishop] sit, others stand."

Honorius Augustodunensis, *Gemma Animæ* lib. i. cap. 14. (Hittorpius, Paris, 1610. coll. 1184–5.) *De Subdiacono.*

"Subdiacono legente solemus sedere lectio, est praedicatio, sessio, obauditorum responsio, credentium confessio, lectores et cantores sunt Domini negociatores. Subdiacono Epistolam legente, cerei verso ordine ab oriente in occidentem disponuntur, quia lumen doctrinae ab Oriente in Occidentem, id est, per totum orbem per Apostolos diffundebatur."

"While the subdeacon is reading [the Lesson or Epistle] we are accustomed to sit. The lesson is preaching; the sitting posture is the answer of the hearers and the confession of believers; the readers and singers are the Lord's agents. While the subdeacon is reading the Epistle, the candles are arranged in the reverse order, from east to west, because the light of [Christian] doctrine shone from the East to the West; that is to say, it was spread through the whole world by the Apostles."

The same writer also says, *Gemma Animæ*, lib. i. cap. 18. Ibid. col. 1185.

"Episcopus tribus horis missæ sedet, scilicet dum Epistola legitur, dum Graduale, et Alleluia cantitur: quia Christus tribus diebus inter doctores in templo sedisse legitur."

"The bishop sits during three portions of the mass, namely, while the Epistle is read and while the Grail and Alleluia are sung, because we read that Christ sat three days among the doctors in the temple."

Ruperti Abbatis Tuitiensis, *De Divinis Officiis*, lib. i. cap. 32, *De Epistola* (Hittorpius, Paris, 1610. col. 866).

"Igitur, morale legis officium agit Epistola, tantum distans ab eo, quod in officio Missae praecedit sancto Evangelio: quantum servus a Domino, preco a judice, legatus ab eo, qui misit illum. Quapropter cum legitur, non injuria sedemus: cum autem sanctum Euangelium

audimus, demissis reverenter aspectibus, sicut Domino nostro assistimus."

"Therefore, the Epistle represents the moral work of the law, being so far distant from the holy Gospel as it precedes it in the service of the Mass. [It differs from it in the same degree] as the servant from his master, the herald from the judge, the ambassador from him that sent him. Wherefore when it is read we not improperly sit: but when we hear the holy Gospel, we stand as it were before our Master with faces reverently looking down."

Hugonis de Sancto Victore Canonici Regularis Laterani-ensis, *Speculum De Mysteriis Ecclesiae.* lib. ii. cap. 17. *De Epistola.* (Hittorpius, Paris, 1610. coll. 1397–8.)

"Epistola tantum differt ab Evangelio, quantum servus a Domino, praeco a judice, legatus ab eo qui misit illum. Quapropter cum legitur Epistola, non injuria sedemus. Cum autem Evangelium audimus, dimissis reverenter aspectibus sicut Domino nostro assistimus."

"The Epistle stands in the same relation to the Gospel as the servant to his master, the herald to the judge, the ambassador to him that sent him. Wherefore, when the Epistle is read, we rightly sit. But when we hear the Gospel, we stand with eyes reverently downcast as before our Master."

Innocent III., *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. ii. cap. 33. *De sacerdotis sessu, dum Epistola legitur, et Graduale cantatur.*

"Hactenus tacitus sedebat sacerdos, illud insinuans, quod praedicante Joanne, Christus quodam modo tacebat, quia non praedicabat aperte. Sed, ut tradit evangelista: *Postquam traditus fuit Joannes, venit Jesus in Galilaeam, praedicans Evangelium regni Dei* (Marc. i.). Vel quia sedere victoris est, sessio sacerdotis Christi victoriam signat, qui post jejunium vicit diabolum; nam *reliquit eum tentator, et accesserunt angeli, et ministrabant ei* (Matth. iv.)."

"Hitherto the priest has been sitting in silence, because he represents [Christ, and the Epistle signifies the time of St. John the Baptist]; while John was preaching, Christ as it were kept silence, inasmuch as he did not preach openly. But as the evangelist says: 'After that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God' (St. Mark i. 14). But because it is the conqueror's privilege to sit, the sitting of the priest signifies

the victory of Christ, who overcame the devil after his fast; for the tempter left him, and 'angels came and ministered unto him' (St. Matthew iv. 11)."

Durandus, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, lib. iv. cap. 18. *De sessione sacerdotis et episcopi et ministrorum.*

"Oratione finita sacerdos seu episcopus sedet. Et est notandum quod in missae officio tribus horis sedet videlicet dum epistola legitur . . . . : et dum responsorium et alleluya cantantur: significans tres dies quibus dominus sedit hierosolymis in templo in medio doctorum audiens et interrogans illos."

"When the collect is finished the priest or bishop sits. And it must be observed that he sits during the office of the mass on three occasions, namely, while the epistle is read . . . . : and while the responsory and alleluia are sung: signifying the three days during which the Lord sat in the temple at Jerusalem in the midst of the doctors, hearing them and asking them questions."

Bowing at the Name of Jesus.

Religious ceremonial identical in character and meaning with the ceremonial of common life, p. 101. Certain religious ceremonies pagan in origin, pp. 101—103. Relation of religious reverences or bowings to those in vogue in common life, pp. 103, 104. Authoritative sanction for reverences in the English Church, pp. 104, 105. Assumed origin of the custom of bowing at the Holy Name, pp. 105—107; history of the origin and spread of the gesture, pp. 107—116. The Injunction of Elizabeth in 1559, pp. 116—120; formally established by the English Church in 1603, p. 120; not based on St. Paul's words, but on an accustomed usage, p. 121. Puritan acquiescence, in 1661, in the directions of the canon of 1603, p. 122. Evidence in favour of the gesture from visitation articles of the seventeenth century, pp. 123, 124. *Appendix*, Post-Reformation evidence, 125, 126.

V.

BOWING AT THE NAME OF JESUS.

IT has been sometimes assumed, that the ceremonies of the Church are, in their origin, character, and meaning, different from those which obtain in common life. Such a proposition cannot be maintained with any show of reason or truth. The fact is, that the ceremonies of the Church and those of every-day life are practically identical in character and meaning; with this difference, that religious ceremonies have regard to sacred things, whilst the ceremonies of common life are concerned with secular things. The ceremonies of the Church have the same relation to those of private life, as revealed religion has to natural religion. We speak of revealed religion—in contra-distinction to natural religion—as super-natural; that is to say, as the adjective 'supernatural' implies, as built upon and developed out of merely natural religion. Supernatural religion is but natural religion purified, transformed, fulfilled. And the Church has in her wisdom acted on the same principle in the matter of her ceremonial observances, some of which are even pagan in their origin.

For example; it is almost universally admitted that the Easter Festival derives its name from *Eostre*, the Saxon goddess of the East, whose festival was celebrated in April, in which month the Christian Easter Day usually occurs. It is so derived by Bede.[1] The Festival of All Saints, similarly, had a pagan origin; for it was suggested by Pope Boniface's action in the year 610, or thereabouts, in dedicating the Pantheon, previously a heathen temple of all the gods, as the church of St. Mary and All Martyrs.[2] Polydore Vergil declares that the Ember Fasts were received into the Church from the Romans, who made sacrifices in the three seasons called *Vinalia*, *Robigalia*, and *Floralia*—the first for the vintage; the second for fruits, of which the god was Rubigus, whose rites were performed on April 25th; and the third for all flowers, over

[1] "Eostur-monath, qui nunc Paschalis mensis interpretatur, quondam a dea illorum (Anglorum populi) quæ Eostre vocabatur, et cui in illo festa celebrabant, nomen habuit: a cujus nomine nunc Paschale tempus cognominant, consueto antiquæ observationis vocabulo gaudia novæ solemnitatis vocantes."—*De Temporum Ratione*, cap. xv. de mensibus Anglorum.

[2] "Pope Boniface obtained a grant of the Pantheon from the Emperor Phocas: and dedicated it in honour of St. Mary and All Martyrs. This was on the 11th of May: and the feast of All Martyrs was kept on that day under the title of *S. Maria ad Martyres*. Gregory IV. transferred it to Nov. 1st, because the harvest was then gathered in: and because the feast of All Apostles being kept on May 1st, the other would answer to it half-yearly."—Neale and Webb, Trans. of Durandus' *Rationale*, p. 231, note. Leeds, 1843.

which the goddess Flora presided.[1] "Hence it appears, that the early Roman pontiffs celebrated the same seasons of the year, not with an inane superstition, but with three fasts for the same reason—and thus converted the vain rites of the ancient heathen into the cultivation of true piety."[2] The Christian custom of worshipping towards the East is almost certainly borrowed from the old heathen sun-worship, with new and higher associations. "The manner of turning our faces to the East when we pray, is taken from the old heathens, who, as Apuleius reminds us, used to look eastward and salute the sun. We use this custom to put ourselves in remembrance that Christ is the Sun of Righteousness, who discloses all secrets."[3]

And the Church has taken this bold line of transference, not only in regard to things distinctly pagan, but also in regard to things secular. Not a few of our most cherished religious ceremonial-usages are borrowed from the customs which prevail in common life in the world. In the subject which we are about to discuss, namely, that of reverences or bow-

[1] Dom Germain Morin has an excellent article on this origin in *Revue Bénédictine*, 1897. Août, p. 337.

[2] Polydore Vergil, *De Invent. Rerum*, lib. vi. cap. 3, p. 362. See Hampson, *Medii Ævi Kalendarium*, Vol. ii. p. 113.

[3] Langley's *Abridgement of Polydore Vergil*, p. 109, qu. Brand's *Popular Antiquities*, Vol. ii. p. 317. Bohn. See S. Aug. *De Sermone Domini in monte*, ii. 5.

ings, this is conspicuously the case. In common life, we bow as a token of respect, even to our intimate friends; we bow more profoundly or bend the knee to our superiors. The Italians, who in the sixteenth century authoritatively introduced genuflection at the Consecration of the Eucharist, genuflect to a bishop.[1] Formerly they genuflected to the emperor. With them genuflection is used outside religion, and that is the origin of its use in religious worship. It is in both cases the same act dictated by a similar motive, namely, the motive of reverence.[2] Englishmen take off their hats when they enter a friend's house: they do the same on entering the house of God. The action is the same, in both cases; and it is dictated by the same motive, namely, that of showing respect.

There are two occasions, and two only, on which the English Church, since the Reformation, has directed the use of reverences (1) At the mention in divine service of the Holy Name; (2) On entering and leaving a church, towards the altar. Of these we will now

[1] "Regulariter quoties ipsi Canonici transeunt directe ante altare, vel ante Episcopum, caput, et humeros profunde inclinant: beneficiati autem, et cæteri de clero genuflectere debent transeundo, tam ante altare, quam ante Episcopum." —*Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, lib. i. cap. xviii. Paris, 1633.

[2] "Reverentia a verbo *revereor*, est honoris alicui exhibitio, et quidem non Deo solum, sed et rebus sacris, ac hominibus etiam natu majoribus, ac dignitate."—Catalani, *Sacrarum Cæremoniarum*, lib. 3, tit. 1, Vol. ii. p. 329. Romæ, 1751.

proceed to speak in this and in the following essay respectively.

I.

It is generally assumed, though without sufficent justification, that the origin of bowing at the mention of our Lord's human name, JESUS, is to be traced to the words of St. Paul, "at the name of Jesus every knee should bow."[1] There is little doubt that these words had nothing to do with the origin of this reverent act of homage in question. The commonly received opinion, that they are the source from which the gesture of reverence at our Lord's human name is derived, is based on an imperfect rendering of the original Greek[2] in the authorized version of the New Testament, which has been corrected in the revised version of 1885, in which we read, "in the name of Jesus every knee should bow."[3] Alford, in

[1] Phil. ii. 10.

[2] The Greek is, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*. The Latin Vulgate has, in nomine.

[3] Daniel Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*, Vol. i. p. 195; Vol. ii. p. 220. London, 1822, points out this mistranslation, in opposing the custom of bowing at the Holy Name. He says, "Bowing at the name of Jesus, grounded upon a false interpretation of that passage of Scripture, *At the name* . . ." "The Puritans always excepted against bowing at the name of Jesus. . . . Nevertheless it was enjoined by the 18th canon, and in compliance with that injunction, our last translators inserted it into their text, by rendering *ἐν τῷ ὀνοματι*, *in the name of Jesus*, as it was before both in the Bible and Common Prayer-book, *at the name of Jesus*, as it now stands." Neal wrote his work 1732–1738.

Archbishop Laud, in 1637, replying to charges made against

commenting on the passage, says, "*that in the name of Jesus every knee should bend*, i.e., all prayer should be made—not '*at* the name of Jesus every knee should bow,' which surely the words will not bear." It cannot be maintained that St. Paul is giving a command to bow the knee or the head at the mention of the Sacred Name. The words of St. Paul must be read in the light of those of the prophet Isaiah, of which they are a quotation: "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear."[1] The

the bishops, referred to this same matter, thus—"The 8th Innovation charged upon them, was bowing *at* the name of Jesus, and altering to that end the words in the Epistle on the Sunday next before Easter, by changing '*in* the name of Jesus,' to '*at* the name of Jesus.' And it was answered unto this, That bowing at the name of Jesus, was no innovation made by the prelates of this age, but required by the Injunction of Queen Elizabeth, in the very first beginning of the Reformation: And secondly, Though it be '*in* the name of Jesus,' in the old editions of the Liturgy; yet it is '*at* the name of Jesus,' in the translation of Geneva, printed in the year 1567, and in the new translation authorised by King James."—Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, Part ii. p. 58. Dublin, 1719. See also Collier, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part ii. book ix. fol. 773, 775. Lond. 1708.

The *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* (lib. ii. cap. 21), in the directions for Palm Sunday, has, "Cum subdiaconus in Epistola pronunciabit verba illa, *Ut in nomine Jesu omne genu flectatur*, episcopus, et omnes usque ad terram genuflectent, et permanent genuflexi usque ad illa verba, *Et infernorum*, inclusive." Catalani attributes this usage to the pontificate of Gregory xiii., 1572–1585. See *Sacrarum Cæremoniarum*, lib. ii. tit i. cap. 39, § v. Vol. ii. p. 151.

[1] Isaiah xlv. 22, 23.

source from which St. Paul's words are derived, as the context shows, points out that they refer to an universal acknowledgment in the future of Christ's supremacy, as God Incarnate—they contain a prophecy, rather than a precept. The passage is also patient of the meaning, that every created being should pray to God "in the name of Jesus." It seems, then, that the only support which we can derive from St. Paul's words is, that they show that the custom of making an outward reverence at the mention of the Holy Name is not contrary to the spirit of the New Testament. We cannot fairly appeal to them as giving, either the origin of, or the authority for, the custom. Had St. Paul's words contained a command to pay external reverence at the mention of the Holy Name, it is quite impossible to believe that the Oriental Church could have disregarded so plain direction. Outward reverence in this matter is not paid in the Oriental Church.

From this fact, we may reasonably conclude, that the gesture in question took its rise after the division between East and West, which took place in the ninth century. Daniel Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*,[1] says, that bowing

1 Vol. iii. p. 175. Lond. 1822. Neal is evidently quoting Prynne, who, in his charge against archbishop Laud, attributed the authorization of the gesture to pope Gregory x., "who first introduced and prescribed it in *Sexta Decretalia*, lib. 2. tit. 3. c. 2, from the popish councils of Basil, Sennes, Augusta, with others, which enjoin the use of it; and from *Cæremoniale Romanum*, lib. 2. c. 8. p. 206, which directs and

at the name of Jesus was not introduced before the time of Gregory X. (1271–1276), who first prescribed it; and that from the Councils of Basle, Sennes, and Augusta, it was afterward inserted in the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*. Cor-

prescribes thus—*Diaconus prosequitur Evangelium, et cum profert nomen*, Jesu, *vel* Mariæ, *inclinat se, sed profundius cum dicit*, Jesus; *quod et omnes faciunt.*"—*Canterbury's Doom*, p. 64. London, 1646.

From this quotation from the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, two things are to be observed: (1) The bowing is ordered at the mention of the Holy Name in the Gospel. (2) The gesture is made, less prominently, at the mention of the name, Mary; which is the present rule according to the Roman rubrics. "Cum nominatur nomen *Jesus*, caput versus crucem inclinat: quod etiam facit cum nominatur in Epistola. Et similiter ubicunque nominatur nomen beatæ Mariæ vel Sanctorum, de quibus dicitur Missa, vel fit commemoratio, item in Oratione pro Papa, quando nominatur, semper caput inclinat, non tamen versus crucem."—Ritus Celebrandi Missam. v. De Oratione, § 2. *Missale Romanum*. Venice, 1713. The foregoing rubric is founded on earlier Roman directions. John Burchardt, in his *Ordo Missæ* of 1502, directs, ". . . . quotiescunque hoc nomen Jesus nominat caput Deo inclinat. Convenit etiam, quod cum nomen gloriosæ virginis Mariae nominatur, caput ei inclinetur."—p. 204 *a*. Venice, 1572. Paris de Crassus, in his *De Cæremoniis Cardinalium et Episcoporum*, which appeared at Rome in 1564, directs ". . . . dumque nomen Jesu (non autem *Christi* solum) audit, detectum caput inclinat. Dum autem *Mariæ* matris Jesu, aut Papae tunc viventis proprium nomen audit, parum caput inclinat."—Lib. i. cap. xxii. p. 18 *b*. Venice, 1582.

In the Additions to the Rules of Syon Monastery (Aungier, *Hist. and Antiq. of Syon Monastery*, p. 321. Lond. 1840), occurs,—"*Sisters:* They schal enclyne profoundly to the names of *Jhesu* and *Maria*, as oft as they shall here them pronounced. *Brothers:* To the names *Jhesu* and *Maria*, they schal inclyne profoundly as often as they here them rehersyd." The author is indebted to Mr. Cuthbert Atchley for drawing his attention to this and other references quoted in this essay.

nelius à Lapide, in commenting on Philippians ii. 10, says, "Vide pia Gregorii verba hac de re apud Serarium, in c. 2. Josue qu. 15, quibus statuit ut ad nomen *Jesu* omnes *flectant genua cordis sui, quod vel capitis inclinatione testentur.*"[1] "Observe the devout words of Gregory concerning this matter, in which he ordained that at the name Jesus all bow the knees of the heart, or testify the same by an inclination of the head."

There is, however, an earlier reference to the custom, namely, that contained in an indulgence, granted by pope Urban IV. (1261–1264), of one hundred days of enjoined penance, to all who bowed devoutly as often as the name Jesus was mentioned in church. This is quoted in the Exeter Consuetudinary, and the later Sarum books.[2] It seems highly probable that the custom arose in consequence of St. Bernard's great devotion to the Holy Name, in the twelfth century, and that its rapid spread was due to Urban's indulgence. Had the gesture been common previously, we should

It is remarkable enough, that the mention of the custom of bowing at the name of Mary is half a century earlier than that of bowing at the name of Jesus. *The Ancren Riwle*, which seems to have been written in the first quarter of the thirteenth century (Preface, xv.), directs the nuns to bow "at Ave Maria, and wheresoever you hear Mary's name named."—*The Ancren Riwle*, p. 19. Camden Soc.

[1] *Commentaria*, Antwerp, 1665. fol. 576.

[2] See Chambers, *Divine Worship in England*, p. 92. The author has not been able to verify Mr. Chambers' references.

naturally have expected to find frequent allusions to it in the literature of the times. St. Bernard, who wrote so much that is beautiful concerning the Holy Name,[1] frequently mentions the bowing of *the knee of the heart* in the Holy Name, but, as is most remarkable, never alludes in any way to bowing *the head*. Had the latter custom been in vogue in his day, it is impossible to believe that he would not have referred to it frequently. The author has been unable to discover any allusion to the custom of bowing the head at the Holy Name, in St. Bernard's writings.

In the year 1274, ten years after the death of pope Urban, the following Canon was decreed at the second Council of Lyons: "And that which is written concerning all, that 'in the name of Jesus every knee should bow,' the same let each for his own part fulfil in himself, especially when the Holy Mysteries of the Eucharist are being celebrated, by bowing the knees of his heart at every mention of that glorious name, and in witness thereof, at least inclining his head."[2]

This Canon is important: it lays stress on bowing the knees of the heart, at the mention of the Holy Name during the cele-

[1] e.g., the hymn "Jesu, dulcis memoria."

[2] qu. Keble, *Eucharistical Adoration*, 3rd ed. ch. ii. pp. 25, 26. See also Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, 2nd ed. p. 278, where reference is given, Const. xxv. Labb. tom xi. P. i. col. 990.

bration of the Eucharist—of which more hereafter; and St. Paul's words, in Phil. ii. 10, are referred to the bowing of the knees of the heart, as is usual; the bowing of the head being regarded as a subsidiary outward token of inward reverence, and not as the important matter to be considered. Pope John XXII. (1316–1334) confirmed the indulgence granted by Urban IV.,[1] according to the Exeter and the Sarum books, which seem to show that the custom was still far from general. Had it been at all widespread, there would have been no occasion to encourage it by means of an indulgence. Canon 4 of the Council of Avignon in the year 1324, and also a Canon of the Council of Besiers in the year 1351, granted an indulgence of ten days to all shriven and truly penitent persons who bowed their heads at the mention of the Holy Name.[2] In the same year (1351) a similar indulgence of ten days was granted, at a provincial council held at Dublin, to all clergy and laity who inclined their minds, heads, and bodies, devoutly whenever they heard the name of Jesus in church, whether they were in choir or elsewhere, and humbly bowed themselves to God. This important constitution is as follows:

[1] "Johannes vero vigesimus secundus uncentos dies veræ indulgentiæ omnibus qui ad Jesu genua flecterent, vel caput inclinerent, vel tunderent pectus, largitus est."—Alfonsi Salmeronis Toletani e Soc. Jesu Theologi *Commentarii.* Coloniæ Agrippinæ, 1604. t. iii. p. 335.

[2] See *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 278.

"*De adorando nomine Jesu.* Cumque dicatur per apostolum ut in nomine Domini J. C. omne genu flectatur coelestium, terrestrium, et infernorum, quum pium et fructuosum esse censemus, quod Christi fideles cum ipsum sanctum nomen ipsorum auribus insonuerit, Deo inclinent devotius cor et caput, consentiente eodem concilio, monemus et hortamur in Domine subditos nostrae provinciae Dublin, quod omnibus et singulis ecclesiis per nostras dioecisin et provinciam divina officia quotiescunque celebrantes et audientes, tam clerici cujuscunque status quam laici, tam in choro quam alibi in ecclesia, audito eo sanctissimo nomine Jesu mentem, caput, et corpus devotissime inclinent, et humillime Deo flectant, et ut eo ferventius et perseverantius in isto sacro proposito perseverent, qui sunt mercedem spiritualem a Domino accepturi, singulis subditis dioecesis et provinciae praedictae, vere de peccatis suis confessis, et contritis, in dictis choris et ecclesiis cum ipsum sanctissimum et dulcissimum nomen Jesu inter missarum, et aliorum divinorum officiorum solennia audierint, humiliter sic inclinantibus, decem dies indulgentiae, viz., qualibet die dominica, et aliis festis per circulum anni duplicibus de omnipotentis Dei misericordia confidentes misericorditer elargimur."[1]

"Since it is said by the apostle that in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ every knee

[1] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 20.

should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, as we consider it a holy and fruitful thing that Christ's faithful people should more devoutly incline both heart and head to God when that holy name sounds in their ears; we instruct and exhort our subjects of the province of Dublin, with the consent of the same Council, that in each and every church throughout our diocese and province, those who celebrate and hear divine service, both clergy of whatsoever degree and laity, not only in choir but also elsewhere in church, as often as they hear that most holy name, shall with all devotion and humility incline and bend their mind, head, and body to God; and in order that they may so much the more fervently and strenuously persevere in that holy intention, as being those who are about to receive a spiritual reward from the Lord; we, by the mercy of Almighty God, graciously and confidently grant ten days of indulgence, namely, on every Lord's day and on other double feasts through the circle of the year, to all our subjects of the diocese and province aforesaid, who having confessed their sins in a true state of contrition, thus humbly bow themselves when they hear that holiest and sweetest name of Jesus, during the solemnities of the Mass and other divine offices in the said choirs and churches."

Abulensis, a distinguished medieval com-

mentator, says, "Ecclesiæ communis et laudabilis consuetudo magis honorat istud nomen, Jesus, quam nomen Deus. Unde audito nomine, Jesus, devoti fideles aut caput inclinant, aut genua flectunt; quod non faciunt audito nomine, Deus."[1] "There is a common and laudable custom of the Church, whereby the name Jesus is even more honoured than the name God. For which cause, when the name of Jesus is heard, the faithful people either bow the head or bend the knees; which they do not on hearing the name of God."

Catharinus, sometime archbishop of Conza (1487–1553), apparently refers to the indulgence of pope John XXII., in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, in which occurs: "Exstat justissimum pontificis decretum, quo mandatur, ut ad hoc nomen Jesus omnes inclinarent caput."[2] "There is a most just decree of the pope, wherein it is ordered that all incline the head at this name Jesus." In Taverner's *Postils*, published in the year 1540, in reference to Phil. ii. 10, we find, "Nowe by the bowing downe of every knee, is ment the submission and mekenyng of al creatures to theyr maker, not that eyther angels or dyvels have bodely knees, but bycause we men that have bodyes, in our submission and humbeling of our selves do

[1] qu. Cornelius à Lapide, in Phil. ii. 10. fol. 575.

[2] *Catharin. in c. 4. epist. ad Roman.*, qu. Cornelius à Lapide, in Phil. ii. 10. fol. 576.

bow our knees."[1] In the year 1549, a council at Mainz ordered, "cum ad venerabile et tremendum nomen Jesu deveniret, caput aperit, inclinatur."[2] "When we shall come to the venerable and tremendous name Jesus, the head is uncovered and inclined."

In the year 1558 the bishop of Worcester, as commissioner of Cardinal Pole, enjoined in the cathedral of Hereford, that at the naming of Jesus in singing or saying, every man should give token of reverence with vailing (removing?) their bonnets and bending their knees.[3]

Thomas Becon, one of archbishop Cramner's chaplains, when in exile in Queen Mary's reign, wrote his famous *Displaying of the Popish Mass;* in which he says, "When the Gospel is read . . . the people stand up and make courtesy when they hear the name of Jesus."[4] It seems that this reverence was paid only at the mention of the Holy Name in the Gospel of the Mass, in Becon's time. Fulke, in his controversy with Martiall, published in 1580, said, "But Martiall thinketh, that as our ears call upon us to bow our knees at the name of Jesus, so do the eyes at the sight of the crucifix. But he must understand, that we worship not the sound of the name of Jesus, rebounding in the

[1] Epistle on Palm Sunday, p. 166. Oxford, 1841.

[2] *Concil. Moguntinum* § 2, *Codices.* qu. Cornel. à Lap. in Phil. ii. 10. fol. 576.

[3] See Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 79. The author has been unable to discover the exact reference here.

[4] *Works*, iii. p. 264. Parker Soc.

air; but the power, the majesty, and authority of Jesus, we acknowledge and honour: not called upon by the sound of the name of Jesus, but by the voice of the Gospel." [1]

II.

In the year 1559, shortly after Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne, she issued a set of Injunctions, the fifty-second of which directs, "that whensoever the name of Jesus shall be in any lesson, sermon, or otherwise in the church pronounced, that due reverence be made of all persons young and old, with lowness of courtesy, and uncovering of heads of the menkind, as thereunto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath been accustomed." [2]

[1] Fulke's *Answers*, Art. x. p. 204. Parker Soc.

[2] Cardwell, *Doc. Annals*, i. p. 231. It was partly in consequence of the enforcement of this order upon the Puritans that a great storm arose, as the literature of the time abundantly shows. Neal states, that "no penalty was annexed to the neglect of the ceremony, nor did any suffer for it, till bishop Laud was at the head of the Church, who pressed it equally with the rest, and caused about twenty ministers to be fined, censured, and put by their livings, for not bowing at the name of Jesus, or for preaching against it."—*Hist. of Puritans*, ii. p. 221. Neal gives as his authority for this statement, *Usurpation of Prelates*, p. 165.

"On June 3, 1629, Henry Burton, rector of St. Matthew, Friday Street, is 'charged with not bowing his head at the text in a funeral sermon preached by him there, the text being, *Come, Lord Jesus, etc.* In the sermon he said we were growing so idolatrous and fallen into such superstition, that it was a wonder that those who were zealous in religion did not like Phynieas draw their swords . . .' Accordingly Henry is suspended on June 18, but on July 14 his suspension is relaxed."—Hennessy, *Notes on the Ecclesiastical Registers of London*, St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans. Vol. iv. p. 335.

George Withers, writing to the Prince Elector Palatine, about 1560, informs him that, "at the pronouncing of the name of Jesus, they (Queen Elizabeth and Archbishop Parker) have ordered all persons to take off their hats and bow their knees."[1] Cartwright tells us in his Admonition[2] that, "when Jesus is named, then off goeth the cap, and down goeth the knees, with such a scraping on the ground that they cannot hear a good while after; so that the word is hindered; but, when any other names of God are mentioned, they make no curtesy at all; as though the names of God were not equal." Archbishop Whitgift, in defending the custom, says, "One reason, that moved Christians in the beginning the rather to bow at the name of Jesus than at any other name of God, was because this name was most hated and most contemned of the wicked Jews, and other persecutors of such as professed the name of Jesus; for the other names of God they had in reverence, but this they could not abide; wherefore the Christians, to signify their faith in Jesus, and their obedience unto him, and to confute by open gesture the wicked opinion of the Jews and other infidels, used to do bodily reverence at all times when they heard the name of Jesus, but especially when the Gospel was read, which contained that glad tidings of salvation which is procured unto man by Christ

[1] *Zurich Letters*, Second Series, lxii. p. 161. Parker Soc.
[2] See Whitgift's *Works*, iii. p. 384. Parker Soc.

Jesus; whereupon also he is called Jesus, that is, a Saviour."[1]

It will be observed that Whitgift refers to the reverence made "especially when the Gospel is read." Bishop Montagu, in his visitation articles of 1638 makes the same distinction, in asking, "Do your parishioners bend or bow at the glorious, sacred, and sweet name of Jesus, pronounced out of the Gospel read?"[2] Bishop Andrewes has a similar question, "In the reading the holy Gospel, and never else, is adoration made at the name of Jesus; for then only is it in its right exaltation; and then men stand in a posture ready to make reverence."[3] These last words of Bishop Andrewes appear to give or suggest a good reason why a reverence at the Holy Name was to be made only at the liturgical Gospel. At all other readings of the Scripture, it is assumed that people are sitting, and so not in the posture to bow the knee. In all other parts of the Church service, the Creeds excepted, in which the Holy Name occurs, the people are kneeling, which is in itself a posture of adoration and reverence.[4] We seem here to have the reason why the custom of bowing at the Holy Name in the Creeds is almost universally observed, and that

[1] Whitgift's *Works*, iii. p. 390. Parker Soc.
[2] Tit. v. 14. *2nd Report, Rit. Com.*
[3] *Minor Works*, p. 152. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.
[4] See the question of Bp. Morley, and other bishops, p. 124.

too in a very marked way.[1] Another reason for the prevalence of the gesture during the recitation of the Creeds is, that in them Christians make with their mouths an act of faith in Jesus Christ, which is emphasised by an external act of reverence. Dr. Bisse, however, in defending the custom in question, says, in reference to the wording of Elizabeth's Injunction of 1559—"uncovering of heads of the menkind," and "with lowness of courtesy" in women—"But which way soever this reverence be expressed, by men and women, whether the former by bowing the head, the latter the knee, when standing; or both by bowing the body, when kneeling or sitting, as it is now accustomed; yet the reason is still one and the same, profitable and holy, which is the due acknowledgment, that *Jesus is the Lord*."[2]

But to go back from this digression, in the order of time: In 1561, Davies, Bishop of St. Asaph, issued the injunction, "That in time of service read or sung in the church, so often as the name of Jesus, being our Saviour, shall be rehearsed and pronounced, due reverence be made of all persons young and old with lowliness of courtesy, and entending of men's heads."[3] This is in accordance with Queen Elizabeth's injunction of 1559.

[1] See *British Magazine*, 1841, Vol. xix. p. 66.
[2] *The Beauty of Holiness.* Decency and Order in Publick Worship, p. 65. Lond. 1723.
[3] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv. p. 229.

In 1566, Beza complained of it, as a grievance in the English Church, that people were expected to stand up at the name of Jesus—"That there should be no standing up at the name of Jesus."[1] Possibly this custom of standing up was in order that people might be in a suitable posture for bowing the knee: possibly Beza did not quite understand what the English did.

The State regulation of 1559, previously referred to, was formally established by the Church in 1604. In the Canons set forth in that year, the eighteenth canon directs, that "when in time of divine service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying by this outward gesture, their due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true and eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world."[2]

[1] *Zurich Letters.* Second Series. liii. p. 134, Parker Soc.

[2] Cardwell, *Synodalia.* Vol. i. p. 255. This canon was reconsidered and re-imposed by Convocation in 1662. In May of that year, "in accordance with the request of the Commons, the bishops and the other members of Convocation were desired to prepare a canon on the gestures to be used in the time of divine service. The subject was discussed on the 10th of May, in the upper house, when it was decided that the canon of 1604, under the title of *Solemn reverence during the celebration of divine service*, should be considered by the lower house; and on the 12th of May, the canon, being the eighteenth of those of 1604, was approved and confirmed."—Lathbury, *Hist. of Convocation*, p. 295. See also Kennet's Register, 671, 680; *Syn. Ang.* III. 112; Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv. 575.

It is to be noticed that in this Canon, as also in Elizabeth's Injunction of 1559, upon which it is founded, no allusion is made to St. Paul's words in Philippians ii. 10, as giving authority for the custom. In both directions we are referred, not to any Scriptural authority, but to an accustomed usage of the English Church: the reverence is to be made in accordance with ancient precedent.[1] Hooker makes a similar reference to old custom in defending the gesture. He says, "Now because the Gospels which are weekly read do all historically declare something which our Lord Jesus Christ himself either spake, did, or suffered, in his own person, it hath been the custom of Christian men then especially, in token of the greater reverence, to stand, to utter certain words of acclamation, and at the name of Jesus to bow. Which harmless ceremonies as there is *no man constrained to use;* so we know no reason wherefore any man should yet imagine it an unsufferable evil."[2] The Fifth Book of

[1] Heylyn, referring to Elizabeth's Injunction of 1559, says, "Though this injunction was published the first year of the Queen, yet then this bowing at the name of Jesus was lookt on as an ancient custom; not only used in Queen Mary's reign, but also in King Edward's time, and in those before. And in this case, and in all others of that nature, it is a good and certain rule, that all such rites as had been practised in the Church of Rome, and not abolisht, nor disclaimed by any doctrine, law or canon of the first Reformers, were to continue in the same state in which they found them."—*Cyprianus Anglicus*, Introd. xix. Dublin, 1719.

[2] *Eccles. Pol.* v. 30, § 3. 7th ed. Oxford, 1888.

Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, from which the foregoing words are quoted, was published in 1597, that is some six years before the eighteenth Canon of 1604 was issued. From his words we gather, that the stringent enforcement of the Injunction of 1559 was being very greatly relaxed. A similar relaxing of the force of the Canon of 1604 was made in the year 1660 by Charles II., who put forth a declaration, that "No man shall be compelled to bow at the name of Jesus, or suffer in any degree for not doing it, without reproaching those who out of their devotion continue that ancient ceremony of the Church."[1] The directions of Canon 18 of 1604 seem to have been generally acquiesced in, so far, at least, as that the Presbyterian divines in the Savoy Conference of 1661 made no mention of bowing at the Sacred Name, as one of the points which disturbed men's minds in regard to the Prayer Book.

As evidence of the Church's requirement in 1641; on Sept. 8th of that year, the Commons ordered, that "all corporal bowing at the name *Jesus*, or towards the Communion table, be forborne."[2]

[1] Cardwell, *Hist. of Confer.* p. 296.

[2] See Robertson, *How shall we conform to the Liturgy?* 3rd ed. p. 120. Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, part i. p. 24. Lond. 1714.

III.

In the visitation articles of the seventeenth century, we find frequent allusion to the custom of showing external reverence at the mention of the Sacred Name; as the following enquiries testify.

Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury; A.D. 1616. "Whether any of your parishioners do not reverently behave themselves during the time of divine service . . . using all due and lowly reverence, when the blesed name of the Lord Jesus Christ is mentioned?"

The same enquiry was made *verbatim* by Laud, as bishop of St. David's, in 1622: as metropolitan — at Norwich, in 1635; at Winchester, in 1635; at Lincoln, in 1638: also by Andrewes, bishop of Winchester, in 1625; and by Williams, bishop of Lincoln, in 1635.

Curle, bishop of Winchester; A.D. 1633. "Whether is that due reverence and humble submission used within your church or chapel in the time of divine service, as by the 18th Canon is prescribed?"

Wren, bishop of Norwich; A.D. 1636. "Do all use due and lowly reverence, when the blessed name of the Lord Jesus is mentioned?"

Montagu, bishop of Norwich; A.D. 1638. "Do your parishioners bend or bow at the glorious, sacred, and sweet name of Jesus, pronounced out of the Gospel read?"

Juxon, bishop of London; A.D. 1640. "When and as often as in the time of divine service the Lord *Jesus* shall be mentioned, is due and lowly reverence done by all persons present?"

Cosin, bishop of Durham; A.D. 1662. "Doth every person stand up when the Gospel is read, making due reverence when the name of our Lord Jesus is mentioned?"

Morley, bishop of Winchester; A.D. 1662. "Doth every person stand up when the Creed and Gospel are read, making due reverence when the name of our Lord Jesus is mentioned?"

Bishop Morley's question is repeated in visitation articles of various bishops in the years, 1663, 1666, 1671, 1672, 1674, 1675, 1677, 1679, and 1683.—See Appendix E, to the Second Report of the Royal Commission on Ritual, p. 615. From this Report all the foregoing enquiries are quoted.

APPENDIX.

The following post-Reformation evidence, may be added to that given in the preceding pages.

"Q. *Why do we bow at the name of* Jesus?

"*A.* The mentioning of the name of *Jesus*, puts us in mind of him we owe all manner of reverence to, which we express by bowing. Bishop Stillingfleet." *A Plain and Rational Vindication and Explanation of the Liturgy of the Church of England collected out of the Discourses of some of the Reverend Bishops and Doctors of the same Church by way of Question and Answer.* By J. Clutterbuck, Gent. 3rd. Ed. London 1702, p. 19.

"There is a general practice in our churches of bowing here (the Apostles' Creed) at the mention of the name of Jesus. I do not mean to censure any custom which is intended to express veneration for our Saviour; but the practice is founded on a passage of St. Paul too literally understood. . . . At present it is customary to do reverence, when the name of Jesus is mentioned in this and in the Nicene Creed."—Shepherd on the Book of Common Prayer, vol. i. p. 249 (1828 ed.).

"The Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland as revised, amended, and enacted, . . . in . . . 1838." Edin. 1844. pp. 34, 35.

"Canon XXIX. *Enjoining all due Reverence and Attention in time of Divine Service.*"

. . . . . .

"In time of Divine Service the most devout attention shall be given by the people to what is read, preached, or ministered. And that they may glorify God in body as well as in spirit, agreeably to what an apostle enjoins, they shall humbly kneel when the General Confession, the Litany, and other Prayers are read, *making the appointed Responses with an audible voice, in a grave and serious manner;* and shall reverently stand up at the repetition of the Creed, and at the reading or singing of the Psalms, Hymns, or Anthems, bowing devoutly at the name of Jesus in the Creed."

"Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland . . . 1876." Edin. 1876. p. 31.

"Canon XXXIII. *Of the due care of churches; of reverent behaviour and attention in time of Divine Service.*"

"§ 2. All persons attending Divine Service shall bow devoutly at the name of Jesus, especially in the Creeds." (Same as in the Canons of 1863.)

"Code of Canons of the Episcopal Church in Scotland . . . 1890." Edin. 1890. (Now in force.)

"Canon XXXV. *Of Divine Service.*"

"§ 5. All persons attending Divine Service shall show the accustomed reverence at the mention of the Name of Jesus, especially in the Creeds."

Bowing towards the Altar.

Bowing at the Holy Name and towards the altar, alike authorised by the English Church, pp, 129, 130. Résumé of the evidence in favour of bowing towards the altar, from Bp. Jeremy Taylor, pp. 130—133. Later evidence in the Roman Church, pp. 133—135. The Sarum custom, pp. 135. 136. The testimony of Heylyn in 1560, pp. 136—138. The canons of 1640, pp. 138, 139. The seventh canon of 1640, pp. 139—143. Post-Reformation testimony to the lawfulness and continuance of the practice, pp. 143—144. The usefulness of the practice, p. 144.

VI.

BOWING TOWARDS THE ALTAR.

IT will probably come as a matter of surprise to many people to hear that, historically speaking, there is greater authority from ancient precedent for bowing towards the altar, than there is for bowing at the Holy Name. Whilst the latter custom does not appear to have been introduced until the thirteenth century, the former custom is very ancient indeed; and, moreover, it is a custom common to East and West, whilst bowing at the Holy Name is confined to the West. Hence, comparatively speaking, the practice of bowing towards the altar is more Catholic, than the practice of showing external reverence at the mention of the Holy Name. From the point of view of an English churchman, both practices are equally authorized. There is, therefore, an inconsistency in showing reverence when the Holy Name is mentioned in the services of the Church, whilst neglecting the prescribed reverence made towards the altar on entering and on leaving a church. The reason for this inconsistency, which is quite common, is, that, in nine cases out of ten, persons who bow at the Holy Name con-

sider that they are acting in obedience to St. Paul's words, recorded in Phil. ii. 10. In the previous essay, we have pointed out the mistake under which such persons are labouring. St. Paul's words cannot, without doing violence to their literal meaning, be taken as giving a command to show external reverence at the mention of the Sacred Name. The external reverence is in accord with St. Paul's words, and nothing more. Both the reverences referred to, rest upon the authority of the Church; and as English churchpeople we find their authorization in the Canons of the years 1604 and 1640 respectively.

I.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in his treatise *On the Reverence due to the Altar*, written about the year 1637,[1] has collected much evidence from early times concerning the ceremony under consideration, which we proceed to quote.

"We find, in old writers of repute, such expressions as the following: 'saluting the holy table;'[2] 'the altar of God is to be bended to with the knee;'[3] St. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of his sister, 'falling down with faith

[1] The treatise is printed in Vol. v. pp. 315–338, of Bp. Jeremy Taylor's *Works*, edited by Eden, 1849. It has recently been reprinted, with notes by the author of the present work, published by A. R. Mowbray & Co., Oxford, 1899.

[2] Dionys. *Eccles. Hier.* lib. ii.

[3] "Aris Dei adgeniculari. . . ."—Tertul. *De Pœnit.* cap. ix.

before the altar,' and 'bowing her head to the altar;'[1] the same writer gives a command, 'Reverence the mysterious table;'[2] St. Athanasius speaks of 'going towards the holy altar, embracing it, and saluting it;'[3] Socrates relates that the Bishop of Alexandria, 'entering into the sept of the altar, and prostrating himself at the foot of, or under, the holy table, prayed, lying flat on his face;' St. Jerome[4] reproves one, Sabinianus, for laying love-letters by the altar, at a place where a maiden whom he loved came to bend the knee in adoration, thus showing plainly what was the practice of the faithful in his time; Prudentius describes the preparation of a Christian captain and his comrade for battle, telling how they would first adore God at His holy altar, and then go forth to fight.[5] 'Take heed, brethren, that first of all we worship the holy altar,' said the Council of Constantinople.[6] St. Ambrose has the words, 'bowing the loftiness of the head (or, the loftiest head) to the altar.'[7]

"It was the complaint of Salvian,[8] that to approach the altar without reverence or veneration, was disgraceful;[9] to treat the altar with

[1] *De Soror. Gorgon.* orat. xi. [2] Idem. orat. xl.
[3] tom. ii. *Quod duæ in Christo naturæ*, p. 304, ed. Paris, 1627. [4] 48. *ad Sabinianum.*
[5] "At the adoration of His altars, and the signing of the brow with the cross, the trumpets rang out."—lib. ii. *contra Symmachum.*
[6] Fifth Gen. Conc. *sub Mennâ*, act 5.
[7] lib. i. *De Virgin.* [8] lib. iii. p. 93.
[9] "Sordidus et flagitiosus."

contempt, is named by Damascene[1] as the custom of heretics; Synesius[2] blamed himself greatly for daring, as a sinner, to touch the altar; St. Chrysostom expresses the reason why reverence is due to the altar in the words, 'thou dost reverence or honour the altar, because it is the seat of the Body of Christ.'[3]

"In the rubrics of St. Chrysostom's Liturgy[4] nothing is more common than to find such words as, 'they shall make three adorations towards the east;' 'standing before the holy table, they shall worship;' 'bending the head before the holy table.' Similar directions are frequent in the old Latin offices—in the *Ordo Romanus*,[5] almost everywhere, e.g., 'the priest having inclined his head to the altar;' 'bowing himself to the altar;' and similar evidence is afforded by the old Latin Mass, which is confessedly a thousand years old, and has been quoted in proof of the omissions and additions found in later Missals. But it would be wearisome, to writer and to reader alike, to quote one-tenth part of the instances which abound in the ancient liturgies, and specially in the famous Mozarabic Missal. The abundant

[1] *De Hæres.* § 80, tom. i. p. 97. B. [2] *epist.* 67.
[3] hom. xxi. in 2 Cor. cap. x.
[4] passim, tom. xii. p. 776, sqq.
[5] e.g. *Ordo Romanus* ii. 5. "Subdiaconi usque ad altare progredientes, simul se inclinant coram eo."—Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. p. 44. "In hoc honorabili ministerio debet pontifex venire in tribunal ecclesiæ, et inclinare caput contra altare."—*Ordo Romanus* iii. 8. Ibid. pp. 55, 56.

evidence bearing upon the practice of the primitive Church is more than enough to make plain how, formerly, the churches were regarded and the altars approached." [1]

Christopher Marcellus, writing in the year 1516, says, *de Reverentia Altaris*—"Accedens primum ad ecclesiam, sive capellam, pontifex genuflectit ante altare super faldistorium, et capite detecto orat. Cardinales, prælati, et alii omnes, tam clerici quam laici similiter primum intrantes genuflectunt in terram, orantque. Pontifex surgens ab oratione cum mitra veneratur altare, caput inclinando, antequam inde discedat. Cardinales quotiens vadunt versus altare, vel ante illud transeunt, profunde caput inclinant altari. Alii omnes, tam episcopi, quam clerici, sive laici transeuntes ante altare genuflectunt." [2]

"When first he goes to the church or chapel, the pope kneels at the faldstool before the altar, and prays with his head uncovered. The cardinals, prelates and all others, both clergy and laity in like manner, when they first go into the church, kneel on the ground and pray. The pope rising from prayer, with his mitre, makes a reverence to the altar by inclining his head, before he goes away from before it. As often

[1] The foregoing quotations, commencing on p. 130, of this essay, are taken from the author's edition of Bishop Taylor's treatise, referred to in note 1, page 130.

[2] *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum sive Sacrarum Cæremoniarum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ*, lib. iii. sec. i. c. i. fol. cxx. Venice, 1516.

as the cardinals go towards the altar or pass in front of it, they make a profound inclination to it. All others, whether bishops, clergy or laity, genuflect when passing before the altar."

Paris de Crassus, whose *de Cæremoniis Cardinalium et Episcoporum*, was published at Rome in 1564, says, "Cæterum omnes cujuscunque conditionis, et ordinis, qui ante altare pertranseunt, genuflectere quidem ante crucem altaris deberent: sed satis ex inveterato more facient, si profunde inclinabunt."[1] "All others of whatever condition, and order, who pass before the altar, ought to kneel before the altar-cross; but by immemorial custom it is sufficient if they incline profoundly."

In the Roman Missal of 1580, we find, under *Ritus celebrandi Missam*: De ingressu sacerdotis ad altare—"Sacerdos, si vero contigerit eum transire ante altare majus, capite cooperto, faciat ad illud reverentiam. . . . Cum pervenerit ad altare, stans ante illud in infimo gradu, . . . altari, seu imagine Crucifixi desuper posito, profunde inclinat."[2] "The priest, if he happen to pass before the high altar, shall make a reverence to it with his head covered. . . . When he has reached the altar [i.e., the altar at which he is about to celebrate], standing before it on the lowest step, he shall incline profoundly to it, or to the image of the Crucified set above it."

[1] Lib. i. cap. xxii. fol. 19*a*. Venice, 1582.
[2] *Missale Romanum*, Venetiis, apud Juntas. 1580.

Other similar directions for bowing towards the altar abound in the rubrics of the *Missale Romanum*, and also in the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*.[1]

At Sarum, the clergy bowed towards the altar on entering and on leaving the church, as also in crossing the choir. "Chorum intrantes clerici ita ordinate se habeant, ut si ex parte orientali intraverint, ad gradum chori se ad altare inclinent; postea ad episcopum, si presens fuerit. Si vero ex parte occidentali ingressi fuerint, primo ad altare se inclinent, deinde ad decanum. Eodem moderamine chorum exeant. . . . Preterea si quis clericus ab una parte chori in oppositam transierit, in eundo et redeundo ad altare se inclinet."[2]

"The clergy should enter the choir in such order that, if they enter it from the east, they may incline to the altar at the step; and then to the bishop, if he be present. But if they

[1] e.g. "Ante altare majus, episcopus caput cruci profunde inclinabit."—Lib. i. cap. xii. p. 67. Paris, 1633. "Diaconus celebraturus cum ministris, et facta reverentia altari cum genuflexione, si ibi aderit sanctissimum Sacramentum, sin minus, cum profunda capitis inclinatione."—Lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 257.

[2] *The Use of Sarum*, Frere. I. pp. 14, 16. de ingressu et egressu clericorum: de transitu clericorum ab una parte chori in oppositam.

In the *Ceremoniale Parisiense* of 1703, p. 2. Part i. c. ii. § 3, we find. "Omnes in ingressu chori, et egressu, versa facie ad altare, profunde ante altare se inclinabunt. Si sanctissimum Sacramentum publicæ fidelium veneratione sit expositum, omnes genuflectent nudo omnino capite, etiam hyeme."

enter from the west, let them incline first to the altar, then to the dean. Let them follow the same rule in leaving the choir. . . . Moreover if any clerk crosses from one side of the choir to the other, let him incline to the altar in going and returning."[1]

II.

Heylyn, in describing the state of the English Church at the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign (A.D. 1560), tells us that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated in most reverend manner, the holy table seated in the place of the altar, the people making their due reverence at their first entrance into the church;" and that "the ancient ceremonies accustomably observed by the Knights of the Garter in their adoration toward the altar . . . were by this Queen retained as formerly in her father's time."[2] The same historian, in his *Cyprianus Anglicus*, speaking of the same period, says, "As for the duties of the people in those times and places, it was expected at their hands, that due and lowly reverence should be made at their first entrance into the church; the place on which they stood, being by consecration made holy ground, and the business

[1] In 1256, and in the middle of the fifteenth century, the rule at Aberdeen was much the same as that quoted above from the Sarum books.

[2] *Ecclesia Restaurata, or, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Vol. ii. pp. 315, 316. Eccles. Hist. Soc. 1849.

which they came about, being holy business. For this there was no rule nor rubric made by the first Reformers, and it was not necessary that there should; the practice of God's people in that kind being so universal, *Vi Catholicæ consuetudinis*, by virtue of a general and continual usage, that there was no need of any canon to rejoin them to it. Nothing more frequent in the writings of the ancient fathers than adoration toward the east, which drew the primitive Christians into some suspicion of being worshippers of the sun, *Inde suspicio, quod innotuerit nos versus orientis regionem precari*, as Tertullian hath it. And though this pious custom began to be disused, and was almost discontinued, yet there remains some footsteps of it to this very day. For first, it was observed by the Knights of the most noble Order of the Garter, at their approaches toward the altar in all the solemnities of that Order. Secondly, in the offerings or oblations made by the Vice-Chancellor, the Proctors, and all Proceeders in the Arts and Faculties at the Act at Oxford. And thirdly, by most country women, who in the time of my first remembrance" (Heylyn was born in 1600), "and a long time after, made their obeisance towards the East, before they betook themselves to their seats; though it was then taken, or mistaken rather, for a courtesy made unto the minister; revived more generally in these latter times, especially amongst the clergy, by

the learned and reverend Bishop Andrewes, a man as much versed in primitive antiquity, and as abhorrent from anything which was merely popish, as the greatest precisian in the pack." [1]

III.

In the year 1640, in the reign of Charles I., Archbishop Laud occupying the See of Canterbury, a set of memorable canons was put forth by the English Church. These canons are headed :—

Constitutions and canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, presidents of the convocations for the respective provinces of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the bishops and clergy of those provinces, and agreed upon with the king's majesty's license in their several synods begun at London and York MDCXL. in the year of the reign of our sovereign lord Charles, by the grace of God king of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, the sixteenth ; and now published for the due observation of them by his majesty's authority under the great seal of England.[2]

"Before the canons were offered to the houses (of convocation) for their subscription, they were read before the king and privy-council ; the judges, and other eminent persons of the long robe, being present. And here they were approved by the whole audience, the king

[1] Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 11. xviii. Dublin, 1719.
[2] Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Vol. i. p. 380.

giving the archbishop thanks for bringing things to so good an issue. After this solemn approbation, they were subscribed in the upper house by the bishops and the rest of the clergy; none refusing to put their hand but the Bishop of Gloucester."[1]

These canons, adopted by the convocations of the time, and possessing the sanction of the king and his privy-council, by the over-powering force of circumstances, did not receive the confirmation of parliament; and so never passed into the formally acknowledged law of the Church of England. As synodical acts they were perfect in form, they have never been repealed, and thus are possessed of Church authority. The question of their validity is discussed by Cardwell in his *Synodalia*, Vol. i. pp. xxviii., 380, ff., notes.

The seventh of the canons of 1640 is printed here in full.

A declaration concerning some rites and ceremonies.

Because it is gènerally to be wished, that unity of faith were accompanied with uniformity of practice in the outward worship and service of God; chiefly for the avoiding of groundless suspicions of those who are weak, and the malicious aspersions of the professed enemies of our religion; the one fearing the innovations, the other flattering themselves with the vain

[1] Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* pt. ii. bk. ix. Vol. ii. fol. 793. Lond. 1714.

hope of our backslidings unto their popish superstition, by reason of the situation of the communion table, and the approaches thereunto, the synod declareth as followeth :—

That the standing of the communion table sideway under the east window of every chancel or chapel, is in its own nature indifferent, neither commanded nor condemned by the word of God, either expressly or by immediate deduction, and therefore that no religion is to be placed therein, or scruple to be made thereon. And albeit at the time of reforming this church from that gross superstition of popery, it was carefully provided that all means should be used to root out of the minds of the people, both the inclination thereunto, and memory thereof; especially of the idolatry committed in the mass, for which cause all popish altars were demolished: yet notwithstanding it was then ordered by the injunctions and advertisements of queen Elizabeth of blessed memory, that the holy tables should stand in the place where the altars stood, and accordingly have been continued in the royal chapels of three famous and pious princes, and in most cathedrals and some parochial churches, which doth sufficiently acquit the manner of placing the said tables from any illegality, or just suspicion of popish superstition or innovation. And therefore we judge it fit and convenient that all churches and chapels do conform themselves in this par-

ticular to the example of the cathedral or mother churches, saving always the general liberty left to the bishop by law, during the time of administration of the holy communion. And we declare that this situation of the holy table, doth not imply that it is, or ought to be esteemed a true and proper altar, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed: but it is and may be called an altar by us, in that sense in which the primitive church called it an altar, and in no other.

And because experience hath shewed us how irreverent the behaviour of many people is in many places, some leaning, others casting their hats, and some sitting upon, some standing, and others sitting under the communion table in time of divine service: for the avoiding of these and the like abuses, it is thought meet and convenient by this present synod, that the said communion tables in all chancels or chapels be decently severed with rails, to preserve them from such or worse profanations.

And because the administration of holy things is to be performed with all possible decency and reverence, therefore we judge it fit and convenient, according to the word of the service book established by act of parliament 'Draw near,' etc., that all communicants with all humble reverence shall draw near and approach to the holy table, there to receive the divine mysteries, which have heretofore in

some places been unfitly carried up and down by the minister, unless it shall be otherwise appointed in respect of the incapacity of the place, or other inconvenience, by the bishop himself in his jurisdiction, and other ordinaries respectively in theirs.

And lastly, whereas the church is the house of God, dedicated to his holy worship, and therefore ought to mind us both of the greatness and goodness of his divine majesty; certain it is that the acknowledgment thereof, not only inwardly in our hearts, but also outwardly with our bodies, must needs be pious in itself, profitable unto us, and edifying unto others; We therefore think it very meet and behoveful, and heartily commend it to all good and well-affected people, members of this Church, that they be ready to tender unto the Lord the said acknowledgment, by doing reverence and obeisance, both at their coming in and going out of the said churches, chancels, or chapels, according to the most ancient custom of the primitive Church in the purest times, and of this Church also for many years of the reign of queen Elizabeth. The reviving therefore of this ancient and laudable custom we heartily commend to the serious consideration of all good people, not with any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the communion table, the east, or church, or any thing therein contained in so doing, or to perform the said gesture in the celebration of the holy eucharist,

upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus Christ on the holy table, or in mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's majesty, and to give him alone that honour and glory that is due unto him, and no otherwise; and in the practice or omission of this rite, we desire that the rule of charity prescribed by the apostle may be observed, which is, that they which use this rite, despise not them who use it not; and that they who use it not, condemn not those that use it.[1]

From the references given below,[2] there is exceedingly abundant evidence of the con-

[1] Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Vol. i. pp. 404, ff.

[2] Andrewes' *Works*, Vol. iv. p. 374. Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol. Bisse, *The Beauty of Holiness*, Decency and Order in Public Worship, pp. 72, ff. Bramhall's *Works*, Vol. i. pp. lxxix, lxxx; Vol. v. p. 77. Lib. A-C. Theol. *The British Magazine*, Vol. viii. p. 33. 1835; Vol. xii. p. 639. 1837. *Life and Letters of W. J. Butler*, dean of Lincoln, p. 348. Collier's *Eccles. History*, Vol. ii. Part ii. Book ix. foll. 762, 775. Cosin's *Works*, Vol. v. pp. 90, 93, 105, 124. Lib. A-C. Theol. *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 29, 30, 35, 45, 50–63, 236–253, etc. Heylyn's *Cyprianus Anglicus*, Introd. p. 17; also *History of the Reformation*, Vol. ii. pp. 315, 316. Eccles. Hist. Soc. Lathbury's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, 2nd ed. pp. 77, 153, 154, 165, 172, 183, 184, 215. Laud's *Works*, Vol. iv. pp. 201, 206, 220–224, 230–234, 247, 285, 375, 404, 405; Vol. v. pt. i. pp. 205–207; Vol. v. pt. ii. pp. 496, 536; Vol. vi. pt. i. pp. 55, ff. Lib. A-C. Theol. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, Vol. i. p. 223; Vol. iii. pp. 173, ff. Lond. 1822. *Nicholas Ferrar*, ed. T. T. Carter, p. 115, and note. Robertson's *How shall we conform to the Liturgy?* 3rd ed. pp. 116–121. Murray, 1869, where much valuable information is given. Jeremy Taylor's *Works*, Vol. v. pp. 315, ff. edited by Eden,

tinuous usage of bowing towards the altar, in the English Church since the Reformation, from the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth down to the present time. We may say, in fact, that this evidence is quite overwhelming.[1] The authority for, and the evidence in favour of this devout and edifying custom is so very strong, that it becomes a matter of surprise that the making of a reverence towards the altar, on entering and on leaving a church, is so widely neglected by English people. It is one of the many ceremonial usages, which have a most valuable reflex action on the minds of those who practice them, in helping men to realize the sanctity of the house of God.

1849. *Windsor Register*, commonly called *The Black Book*, p. 65 (see note in Laud's *Works*, Vol. iv. pp. 206, 207. Lib. A-C. Theol.). Wordsworth's *Notes on Mediæval Services in England*, p. 57. Wren's *Parentalia*, p. 81.

[1] See Bp. Jeremy Taylor's treatise, *On the Reverence due to the Altar*, edited by Staley, published by Mowbray and Co., 1899, in which the whole subject of bowing towards the altar is treated at length and with considerable detail.

The Altar-Frontal.

Decrees of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, pp. 147, 148; their bearing on the dictum "Omission is not prohibition," p. 148; limitations as to this dictum, pp. 148—150. Roman methods, p. 151. The uncovered altar prescribed by Roman authority, pp. 152—154; as also by English authority, pp. 155—158. Evidence from pre-Reformation usage, pp. 158—162. Symbolical meaning of stripping the altar in Holy Week, pp. 162—163. Quotations from Dr. J. Wickham Legg, and Dr. Reginald Eager, bearing upon the subject of the vested altar, pp. 163—166. Conclusion, p. 167. *Notes*, pp. 167, 168.

VII.

THE ALTAR-FRONTAL.

IF any one will be at the trouble to consult the decrees of the Congregation of Sacred Rites at Rome, he will find scattered up and down the replies given by the Congregation to enquiries the words, "Nihil innovetur," and "Serventur rubricæ." These words signify that some practice or other, not ordered by the Roman rubrics, is disallowed, and must be discontinued. This rule of the Roman Church, that omission is prohibition, appears to us extremely severe; but, for all that, it is the existing rule of the Congregation of Sacred Rites. To give an example[1]—A certain priest was in the habit of making more bows to the cross during Mass, than the rubrics of the missal allowed or specified. The Congregation forbade the practice in question, decreeing that the bow is to be made when ordered, and not otherwise: nothing is to be left out, nothing is to be added. The bowing in question, not being ordered, is an unauthorised addition, and therefore it is forbidden. The bishop who makes the enquiry tells the Congregation of

[1] Vide Gardellini, *Decreta Authentica Cong. S. Rituum*, Appendix i. pp. 73 et seq.

Sacred Rites, that the priest has made the bows in question out of immemorial custom: but the answer is the same; namely, that the rubrics must be kept, unless indeed the practice can be shown to have been in use for two hundred years before the revision of the rubrics of the Roman Missal under Pius V., in the year 1570.

Now, the application of a rule so stringent and absolute may be very well in the case of the Roman Church, because the rubrics of the Mass are so full and precise, that there is no necessity to supplement them. "Serventur rubricæ," in the Roman Church, is therefore defensible. But in the English Church, this is not the case to the same extent. In certain matters of ceremonial, though these are comparatively few, there is obvious need both to supplement and also to interpret the rubrics and canons. Hence, with us, the strict application of the dictum, "Omission to prescribe is prohibition to use," may be pushed too far: it requires some qualification. On the other hand, it needs to be said very plainly, that such qualification must be limited by various considerations, if a state of anarchy in ceremonial observances is to be avoided.

The first limitation is, that the ornament or gesture introduced without rubrical authority, must be an acknowledged necessity. As an example of a necessary ornament of the church, which is not explicitly authorised in the English

Church, we may take the credence table, upon which the elements may stand before they are placed on the altar at the offertory. The rubric[1] cannot be obeyed without such a thing. As an example of a necessary gesture or action on the part of the minister of the Church, which is not named in the rubrics, the giving back of the child by the priest after baptising it, will suffice. It is however to be observed, that omissions of this kind are very few indeed.[2] Where no necessity of supplementing the rubrics or canons exists, *quæstio cadet*, and omission is clearly prohibition. It is idle to deny that the limitation from necessity, has in this matter been very considerably transgressed; and the dictum, "Omission is not prohibition," has been pressed much too far. It has, in fact, been used to cover many irregularities in the way of ornaments and gestures, which it is impossible to defend without special pleading.

The second limitation to the application of the dictum, "Omission is not prohibition," is, that before such a rule can be appealed to, it must be shewn that the ornament or gesture for which sanction is sought was in use in the English Church before the Reformation; that

[1] "The priest shall then place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient."

[2] Dr. Wickham Legg reminds me that even a credence is not an absolute necessity. If the vestry be near the chancel, the elements may readily be brought by the churchwardens from the vestry at the time of the offertory. V. S.

it has not since been forbidden, explicitly or implicitly; and that the occasion for its use still continues. The bishop's mitre, or the signing the elements with the cross in the Prayer of Consecration at the Eucharist, may perhaps serve as an illustration here.

The third limitation in the application of the saying, "Omission is not prohibition," is, that, in any given instance, whether in regard to ornaments or gestures, nothing must be introduced which contradicts the explicit directions of the rubrics or canons. That is to say, the direction to use a given ornament or gesture implies the prohibition to substitute any other ornament or gesture. Where the directions are clear, omission to prescribe an alternative ornament, gesture or action, is obviously prohibition. For example, the rubric directs the celebrant to consume what remains of the Consecrated Elements immediately after the Blessing, and not before. It is notorious that this has been done in some cases after the Communion of the people; on what grounds, it is impossible to say. As a further example of irregularity in this matter, we come to consider the subject named at the head of this article.

I.

In a former article, in which the subject of genuflection at the Eucharist during the Canon was discussed, we remarked that in the Roman Church this practice was introduced many

years before it was authorised by the rubrics of the post-Tridentine Missal. Genuflection was also practised in England in Queen Mary's reign, as we know from the writings of Thomas Becon:[1] although it was not ordered in the rubrics of the missals used in England at that period. Had the Congregation of Sacred Rites, animated by its present spirit, existed before the year 1570;[2] and had the practice of genuflecting during the Canon been brought to its notice by the way of enquiry; the practice would probably have been forbidden, under the dictum, "Nihil innovetur," or "Serventur rubricæ." But uniformity in ceremonial matters has not always been a mark of the Roman Church, nor yet consistency either. A new practice was in course of development, and it was let alone, till public opinion demanded its sanction. It was, in the sixteenth century at Rome, held that omission to prescribe was not prohibition to use: otherwise genuflection would never have been tolerated.

But when we come to consider the subject now about to be examined, namely, that of the covering of the altar, a very different issue

[1] "After ye have once spoken these five words, Hoc est enim corpus meum, over the bread, ye kneel down to it and worship it."—*The Displaying of the Popish Mass*, Becon's Works, iii. p. 270. Parker Soc.

[2] The Congregation of Sacred Rites was instituted in 1588, by Pope Sixtus V., who occupied the papal chair from 1585 to 1590.

is before us. Genuflection was not forbidden, it was merely not prescribed. The leaving the altar uncovered by a frontal or antependium is positively excluded as unlawful by the existing rubrics of the Roman Missal: and this has been the rule since the eighth century.[1] From the old *Ordo Romanus*,[2] we may infer that at the beginning of eighth century it was the rule to keep the altar generally covered: for in this *Ordo*, we find a direction that the altar is to be bare from the evening of Maundy Thursday to the morning of Easter Even. The antiquity of this direction is proved by its being cited by Amalarius, at the beginning of the ninth century.[3] And yet, Italy and Spain excepted, the direction of the Roman rubrics is widely defied on the continent. As to what is to be urged in defence of so flagrant disregard of authority,[4] we leave others to say. The fact, to our astonishment, remains: the direction to cover the altar with a *pallium* or frontal is

[1] Mr. W. B. Marriott, says, "In the sixth century, St. Gregory of Tours speaks of an altar, with the oblations upon it, being covered with a silken cloth during the celebration of Mass. Cum jam altarium cum oblationibus pallio serico opertum esset. (Hist. Franc. vii. 22; compare Mabillon, Liturgica Gallicana, p. 41.)—Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, Vol. i. p. 69. Lond. 1875.

[2] *Ordo Rom.* i. cap. v. § 32. Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* tom ii. p. 22, n.

[3] *De Eccles. Offic.* lib i. cap. 12; Hittorp. col. 334.

[4] Quarti, an important Roman rubricist (Venice, 1737, p. 130), insists on the importance of the altar being covered; and discusses the question whether a priest *sins*, if he celebrates at an altar without a frontal.

not to any extent complied with abroad. The Roman rubric to which we refer is given under *Rubricæ Generales Missalis.* xx. *de præparatione altaris, et ornamentum ejus.* "Hoc altare operiatur tribus mappis. . . . Pallio quoque ornetur (altare) coloris quoad fieri potest, diei festo, vel Officio convenientis."[1] "This altar shall be covered with three linen cloths. . . . It shall also be adorned with a frontal, of the colour as far as possible belonging to the feast of the day or to the service."[2] The *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* directs that the *pallium altaris*, i.e. the altar-frontal, is to be continued right round the high altar, back and front, whenever the altar is not attached to the wall; and that all the other altars are to have frontals of the colour of the day.[3] It may be here said that

[1] *Missale Romanum*, Venetiis, 1713.

[2] A modern writer in *The Month*, May, 1896, says: "It has been maintained by competent commentators, that this rubric even more than insinuates, if it does not explicitly and in so many words prescribe, that rather than that the altar should have no pallium at all, it should in case of necessity, on account of poverty or otherwise, be clothed with a pallium of the wrong colour. There is, moreover, in support of their argument the fact that another rubric connumerates and places on the same level the vestments *of the altar*, of the celebrant, and of the ministers. The eighteenth of the General Rubrics of the Missal says; 'The vestments *of the altar*, of the celebrant, and of the ministers, ought to be of the colour which belongs to the Office and Mass of the day, in accordance with the use of the Roman Church.'"—p. 106.

[3] "Ipsum vero altare majus in festivitatibus solemnioribus, aut Episcopo celebraturo, quo splendidius poterit, pro temporum tamen varietate, et exigentia, ornabitur: quod si a pariete disjunctum, et separatum sit, apponentur tam a parte

the rubrics of the Missal and the directions of the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* are authoritatively binding in the Roman Church, on matters of ceremonial. It would be interesting to know what the Congregation of Sacred Rites at Rome would say, if the practice, so common abroad, of leaving the front of the altar uncovered, was made the matter of a complaint. We think that the Congregation would a little shrink from enforcing "Nihil innovetur," or "Serventur rubricæ," all round in such a case. Certainly any attempt to enforce the rubric referred to, as it now stands, would put many thousands of parish priests on the continent to some little trouble and expense!

The readers of the foregoing essays will by this time have gathered, that we do not think there is any justification in appealing to the continental Churches as our model in cere-

anteriori, quam posteriori illius pallia aurea, vel argentea, aut sericea, auro perpulchre contexta, coloris festivitati congruentis, eaque sectis, quadratisque lignis munita, quæ telaria vocant, ne rugosa, aut sinuosa, sed extensa, et explicata decentius conspiciantur. . . Cætera altaria per ecclesiam pariter palliis concoloribus, decentibusque ornentur."—*Cærem. Episc.* Lib i. cap. xii. They seem to have had a frontal covering the ends of the altar as well as the front, at St. Nicholas, Aberdeen:—"Magister thomas chawmer capellanus altaris beate marie virginis decoravit dictum altare cum duobus dependenciis videlicet frontalibus unum de serico et aliud de panno auri texto circumeuntibus totum altare." This was between 1484 and 1513; *Cartularium Ecclesiae Sancti Nicholai Aberdonensis*, vol. i. p. 64, *New Spalding Club*, Aberdeen, 1888.

monial. In keeping to the ceremonial usages of our own Church, we are but carrying out a principle conspicuously Catholic, namely, that "it is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners."[1] But in spite of this, it is very remarkable that the Roman disobedience in the matter of leaving the altar uncovered has been carefully copied amongst us. And what makes the imitation in this particular matter more intolerable and deserving of condemnation, is, that it involves the same disobedience to English authority, as the continental custom does to Roman authority. It is bad enough, in any case, to follow a Roman custom which is contrary to Roman authority: it is doubly bad to do so in defiance of a direction of the English Church to the contrary. In whatever way we view the practice of leaving the altar-front uncovered, it is a practice dictated by private judgment double-dyed. The matter before us involves a question of authority, and of obedience to authority, apart from individual taste in one direction or the other. To follow inclination at the expense of duty, and private sentiment in defiance of authority, cannot be regarded as desirable.

[1] Article xxxiv. *Of the Traditions of the Church.*

II.

In referring to the custom of the continental Churches in regard to the naked altar, we have stated the authoritative direction which is transgressed. We now proceed to state the case against the uncovered altar in England. The direction to cover the altar is, as is well known, contained in the Canons of 1604. In Canon lxxxii., it is ordered, that the Holy Table shall be "covered, in time of divine service, with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff, thought meet by the ordinary of the place, if any question be made of it."[1] In the Latin version of the Canon we have, "ac tempore divini cultus mensæ operiantur tapete ex serico, sive ex alia materia."[2] The direction is precise and definite: the altar must be "covered with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff."

Now it happens that the covering of the altar by a frontal or antependium is a custom so ancient and so continuous in England, as to come very near being entitled to be regarded as a Catholic custom, relatively speaking. For us in England, a bare altar-front is distinctly Puritan. It was no new direction which was given in the canons of 1604. In 1551, at the close of the reign of Edward VI., Bishop Hooper enquired, "Whether the table for the Communion be

[1] Cardwell, *Synodalia* i. p. 293. [2] Ibid. p. 211.

decked and apparalled behind and before, as the altars were wont to be decked."[1] In 1559, the first year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, a set of Injunctions was put forth, which included a similar direction: "That the Holy Table in every church be decently made, and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly" (i.e. as usually) "covered, as thereto belongeth."[2] In the same year, on the death of King Henry II. of France, the queen appointed his obsequies to be solemnly observed at St. Paul's Cathedral. Strype[3] gives a list of the expenses incurred on this occasion; amongst which we find, "The carpet of velvet for the Communion Table, £16 13s. 4d." At Archbishop Parker's consecration, later in the same year, in Lambeth Chapel, the Holy Table was covered with a carpet: "Principio sacellum tapetibus ad orientem adornabatur; solum vero panno rubro insternebatur; mensa quoque sacris peragendis necessaria, tapeto pulvinarique ornata, ad orientem sita erat."[4] "In the first place the chapel was adorned with carpets in the eastern part; indeed the

[1] *Later Writings*, p. 142, § xxiii. Parker Soc. It seems doubtful if Hooper intended that the holy table should be thus decked: it is possible that he was merely asking a question, with a view to finding out how much "popery" was still rife.

[2] Cardwell, *Doc. Annals.* i. p. 234.

[3] *Annals of the Reformation*, Vol. i. part. i. ch. ix. fol. 127.

[4] *Rituum et ceremoniarum ordo in consecratione reverendissimi domini Matthæi Parker:* Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. p. 276.

floor was covered with red cloth; the table, moreover, necessary for celebrating the holy mysteries, was decorated with a carpet and a cushion, and was placed towards the East." In 1564, Queen Elizabeth issued certain ordinances to Archbishop Parker, in which occurs, "They shall decently cover with carpet, silk, or other decent covering, and with a fair linen cloth, at the time of the ministration, the Communion Table." [1]

If we go further back to pre-Reformation times, we find the same rule observed. Father Bridgett, speaking of early English days, says, "The substructure of the altar was plain, not carved or decorated, and it was covered with a frontal. Hence, when stripped on Good Friday, it did not by its splendour contrast with the mournful appearance of the church, but well symbolised our Lord's body, as it hung naked on the cross." [2] Mr. Peacock says, "The altar-frontal was a movable front of metal, wood, or silk, put close to the fore part of the altar, reaching from the slab on the top to the ground. The frontals were usually of the same colour as the vestments, and were changed at the same times, according to the festivals.

[1] Strype, *Life of Parker*, Vol. iii. book ii. fol. 49.

For further post-Reformation evidence of the use of altar-frontals, see *Hierurgia Anglicana;* and also the Visitation Articles of bishops and archdeacons, given in Appendix E., *Second Report of the Royal Commission on Ritual.*

[2] *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, Vol. i. p. 157. Lond. 1881.

Sometimes the silken frontals veiled the two sides as well as the front of the altar. The modern custom of ornamenting the front of the altar with sculpture or painting was almost, if not quite, unknown in this country before the Reformation."[1] Mr. Comper likewise says, "An absolutely plain fabric of stone, or occasionally of wood, was the rule for the altar at the time of our rubric," i.e., the Ornaments Rubric. . . . "No black covering can compensate for the sense of desolation produced by the appearance of a bare and absolutely plain stone altar stripped of its frontal."[2] Mr. Micklethwaite gives a similar verdict, "There is no English authority for the altar itself being carved and painted. Most old ones were quite plain, but a few were panelled in front."[3] Mr. H. W. Brewer, writing in *The Month*,[4] says, "The early altars are remarkably plain, and have no candle ledge, projecting base mould, or tabernacle. Their extreme plainness was in no way the result of accident, such as want of means or inability to do something better; because it was the case right through the middle ages, even in the rich, handsome

[1] *English Church Furniture*, p. 56, n. The above quotation refers primarily to an altar-front at Braunceton, sold in the year 1566, which evidently was one of the pre-Reformation ornaments still remaining in that year.

[2] *St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.* Vol. iv. p. 87.

[3] *The Ornaments of the Rubric.* Alcuin Club Tracts, i. p. 26, n. 1897.

[4] February, 1897, pp. 162, ff.

churches of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, as we see at Arundel church, the Fitzalan choir of which still retains its mediæval altars. The earliest existing altar in England is in a chapel attached to the cloisters of Westminster Abbey, undoubtedly a portion of the buildings erected by St. Edward the Confessor. . . . The altar follows the usual design, and is absolutely devoid of all ornamentation." In similar terms to Father Bridgett, Mr. Brewer then proceeds to give the reason for this excessive plainness. It was, he says, in order that, on Good Friday when the altars were stripped, they might present the idea of intense sadness. "Fancy the central object in some magnificent minster or cathedral being a bare block of unadorned stonework! Yet the most gorgeous churches in this country would have exhibited such a spectacle on Good Friday." Now this prepares us to hear, that it was the rule in England for every altar to be vested at other times. Mr. Brewer goes on to say,[1] "There can be no doubt that English altars were invariably supplied with antependia or movable frontals. They possessed, moreover, the super-frontal, which was not the object now so-called, but a separate article, usually of drapery or metal-work, covering the lower part of the reredos, or dorsal. In small churches, no doubt, both the lower and the upper frontal were of silk-velvet or tapestry,

[1] *The Month*, Feb. 1897, p. 167.

but in minsters and cathedral churches, they had for grand festivals precious frontals of remarkable splendour. One still remains at Westminster Abbey, in a very mutilated condition."[1]

In the Inventory of St. Paul's cathedral, made in the year 1295, we read:

"Unum frontale, de negro Sameto, cum barris et Vineis de aurifrigio bono, ad majus altare.

"Item, aliud frontale strictum breudatum cum pluribus diversis sentis, et in medio breudantur ymagines, crucifixi, Mariæ et Johannis; et in extremitatibus ymagines Petri et Pauli Apostolorum, de done Magistri Johannis de St. Clare, ad idem altare.

"Item, i. frontale de panno inciso, de dono Johannis de Braghyng. Ad altare B. Mariæ V. in navi ecclesiæ.

"Item, pannus-frontalis de baudekynos; et pannus superfrontalis de rubro cendato, cum turrilibus et Leopardis deauratis."[2]

At Durham, before the Suppression, we read, "The dayly ornaments that were hunge both before the altar, and above, were of red velvett, wrought with great flowers of gold in imbroydered worke, with many goodly pictures besides, beinge very finely gilted."[3]

Mr. Comper, in speaking of the custom of decorating the fabric of the altar, and doing away altogether with movable frontals, says, 'I have not met with any authority for this apart from the celebration of mass for the dead; nor is the custom to be found in

[1] This now hangs in a glass case over King Sebert's monument in the south choir aisle.

[2] qu. in *The Month*, Feb. 1897, p. 168.

[3] *Rites of Durham*, p. 6. Surtees Soc.

conservative places on the continent. The numerous altars, all with their frontals of various colours, are conspicuous in an Italian church." [1]

Mr. Micklethwaite gives the same evidence, "*Frontale ad magnum altare* was amongst the things to be found by the parishioners, and old pictures of English altars in use always show them vested. The frontal might take the form of a tablet, such as the well known example in Westminster Abbey, but I think it rarely did so in a parish church." [2]

Dr. Rock gives a similar verdict. In describing the symbolical meaning of the old Sarum and Benedictine, and, we may say, universal, custom of stripping the altars quite bare on Maundy Thursday, and so leaving them till Easter Even—and this is now the Roman use—he says, "At the more solemn festivals, the high altar, in the richer churches, was sheathed in a gold or silver frontal studded with precious stones; while in the less wealthy ones, it was gracefully shrouded in the folds of a costly silken pall: on lower festivals, less splendid but always seemly coverings arrayed the altar in both one and the other. But when the season for mourning came; or when, at due time, the Church, in her dolefulness, threw aside her

[1] *Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book*, pp. 103, 104. Rivingtons, 1899.
[2] *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 26, n.

ornaments, and wept, as in Holy Week, over the buffets and scourgings and the bitter throes of Christ nailed on the rood-tree, the plain altar-front, instead of needing, like some modern ones, to be muffled up to hide its gilding and its brightly coloured sculptures, all ill-suited to be seen on such a day of sadness and of mourning, stood forth—as the spirit of the rubrics has always wished it—an emblem of the Church's heart at the time, sorrowful, and in its own simple unadorned appearance, stripped of its smallest, even its every-day comeliness, as well as its casual splendours. Naked, like Christ Himself upon the cross, the altar presented a touching symbol of sadness."[1]

III.

We will conclude this essay by a somewhat lengthy quotation from Dr. Wickham Legg's paper, *Some Ancient Liturgical Customs now falling into disuse*, which is found in Volume II. pp. 113, ff., of "The Transactions of the St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society;" and which, from the writer's knowledge of ecclesiology, carries considerable weight. "The Holy Table has in some

[1] *The Church of our Fathers*, Vol. i. pp. 233, 234.

At the end of one of his chapters, headed, *cur altaria nudentur*, in explaining the ceremonies of Holy Week, Rupert, A.D. 1111, says: "Cum ergo altare Christum significet, recte ob commemorationem horum, vestitu et ornatu suo spoliatum est."—Ruperti, Abb. Tuitiensis, *De Div. Offic.* lib. v. cap. 30.

cases been left without any decent covering, not merely on Good Friday, but at all times; and to this, I fancy, some have been tempted by a feeling that it is a pity to leave a very handsome altar unseen. Others have done the same because it is a modern French use to have no frontal, although the use of a frontal, like that of a cushion, is certainly contemplated by the Roman rubrics. It seems likely that the disuse of a frontal came in at the same time that the sextons began to leave the linen cloths, with the candlesticks and other ornaments, permanently on the altar; it was a trouble to change the frontal every day to white, or green, or red, according as the saint of the day was a virgin, a confessor, or a martyr; and so the simplest method was to discontinue the use of the frontals altogether.

"The idea that it is a pity not to show whatever we have that is handsome or rich in a church would be disastrous if carried out widely. Have we not been told over and over again that it is a distinguishing note of Christian art, separating it from that of the Renaissance, to lavish careful work and precious ornaments on the House of God, even where they could not be seen? and does not an ultra-montane ritualist, like Dom Prosper Guéranger, insist upon the mystery that should shroud all that is done at the altar? I think this idea of hiding the altar

is a very old Chistian notion. We find mention of veils hung before the altar in the fourth century, which, if not altar-cloths as we mean them, must have served to veil the altars from view; but certainly from the sixth century onwards we read of palls of silk and purple, which certainly covered the altar. (See the article on Altar Cloths in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Vol. i. p. 69. Lond. 1875.) In the Middle Ages the altar was undoubtedly covered, as the inventories continually tell us of fronts or frontals. The Canons of 1603 order the Holy Table to be covered with a 'carpet of silk or other decent stuff,' thus continuing the tradition universal in Christendom down to that time. In Italy, the custom of having a frontal is universal at the present day. As soon as one crosses the Var, which up to 1860 divided France from Italy, one comes into a country of frontals to altars. In Italy it is rare to find an altar without a frontal. All the altars in St. Peter's at Rome have frontals.[1] And even where the altars are very precious and beautiful, they still have frontals. I do not remember ever to have seen the altar of St. Ambrose at Milan, which is encrusted with plates of gold, enamel, and precious stones, exposed during divine service. Even

[1] The high altar at St. Peter's, Rome, is vested in a frontal back as well as front. See Bishop Hooper's question, previously quoted, pp. 156, 157.

at Easter it is covered with a frontal of the colour of the day.

"I should think it likely that naked altars, except in the case of the few stone altars which are met with here and there in England, were unknown until some ten years ago.[1] English altars, in accordance with the tradition of Christendom, and the rule given by the Canons of 1603, were hidden from view."[2]

Dr. Reginald Eager in his most interesting paper, *Notes on Customs in Spanish Churches, illustrative of Old English Ceremonial*, says, "The Spanish Altars were entirely covered by a hanging of some kind, and not as is so often the case now with us having only a top and frontal, back and sides being left bare. In Spain the back and sides often have a rich hanging also, so that the altar itself is completely hidden from view, however handsome its material and adornment may be. This ancient and good custom still prevailed in England as many of us can recollect, until a few years ago, and it still does at St. Peter's, and St. John Lateran in Rome, and other great churches on the continent."[3]

[1] The above was written in 1887.

[2] Dr. J. Wickham Legg, *St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.* Vol. ii. pp. 118, 119.

[3] *St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.* Vol. iv. p. 116.

See *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, quoted previously in this article, pp. 153, 154, n.

We think that enough has been said to demonstrate that the practice of discarding the altar-frontal should be abandoned, wherever it now obtains; not because it is indefensible from a Roman point of view, but because it is forbidden by the rules of the English Church. We can in this case plead, as unhappily we cannot always plead, that the authority of the English and Roman Churches is in complete accord. In the case of churches possessing altars with fixed elaborate fronts, there can be no objection to their being exposed, if it is so desired, out of service time. The letter of the direction of Canon lxxxii. of 1604 is satisfied, by covering the altar "in time of divine service."

NOTE I.—"The practice of leaving the altar bare has but small countenance from the middle ages. Even the early ecclesiologists (in England) did not attempt this; and it was not until we began the practice of making expeditions into France and Belgium, that bare altars were seen to any extent in England. In these countries it may very likely be that their poverty and not their will consents to this. A frontal, of the colour of the Mass, is ordered in the Roman Missal of to-day; it is an instance of the way in which the rubrics of the Roman Missal are disobeyed; which ought not to be surprising to those who are accustomed to see the plainest directions of the Book of Common Prayer set aside. The custom of hiding the altar from sight by a veil may be said to be almost universal in the Church; and at a time when so much is said of the importance of following œcumenical custom, it is a little surprising that Churchmen should allow themselves to be parties to the breaking of the

Church law, merely to fall in with the views of Italianizing architects."—*Mediæval Ceremonial*, The Church Quarterly Review, January, 1900. Vol. xlix. p. 403.

Even in Belgium bare altars seem to be quite modern. "L'antependium aux couleurs liturgiques persista, dans la Belgique, jusqu'à une époque récente."—*Revue de l'Art chrétien*, 1886. 3e série, t. iv. p. 459 note.

NOTE II.—Fr. Bridgett, in his *History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, Vol. ii. pp. 258, 259, in describing the Easter festival in the twelfth century, has an interesting passage relating to the altar-frontal: "The altar-frontal was to be of silk, of silver, or of gold plates, if the church possessed such riches; concerning which Belethus tells us of an interesting symbolic rite practised in some places in his day. In front of the rich antependium, or altar-frontal, were hung three cloths. That nearest to the altar was red; it was covered with one of greyish tint; and that again with black. The matins were sung at early dawn, and during the singing of the psalms and reading of the first lesson, the black cloth was alone seen. This represented the time before the law of Moses. At the end of the first lesson this was removed, and the second or grey antependium was uncovered, representing the Mosaic dispensation. During the third lesson, the red frontal was displayed, indicating the time of grace purchased by the Precious Blood. But when the *Te Deum* was intoned, the red hanging also was removed, and the more brilliant white, or gold, or silver frontal foretold the eternal glory purchased by Christ's death and resurrection."—Fr. Bridgett's reference to Belethus occurs in the latter's *Rationale Div. Offic.* cap. 69, de Nativ. Dom., and cap. 115, de Ornatu Templi Materialis. See also Dr. J. Wickham Legg's treatise, Notes on the History of the Liturgical Colours, *St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.* Vol. i. p. 105, where a most interesting reference to the foregoing matter is made.

The Altar-Lights.

The development of ceremonial, pp. 171—173. Ceremonial development under present circumstances impossible and undesirable in the English Church, pp. 174—176. The six lights of Roman altars, pp. 176—178; their origin, pp. 178—180. Lights placed *on* the altar not ancient, p. 180. Mr. Brewer's theory of the origin of the six lights, p. 181. Two altar-lights more ancient, pp. 181, 182: their symbolic meaning, pp. 182—185. Two lights, or at least one, ordered by Archbishop Reynolds A.D. 1322, in England, p. 185. Evidence as to the number of lights on the altar previous to the Reformation, pp. 186—190; and during the second year of Edward VI., p. 190. Six lights on the altar a departure from old English and medieval precedent, p. 191. Modern Roman rules as to altar-lights, p. 191. Conclusion, p. 192. *Note* 1., Mr. Comper's opinion, p. 193. *Note* 2., Candlesticks to be placed on the *mensa* of the altar p. 194.

VIII.

THE ALTAR-LIGHTS.

IT is impossible to study the subject of religious ceremonial from a historical point of view, without arriving at the conclusion that ceremonial has been a thing of growth or development. This development has been sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. We have been recently told, that the perfection of Western ceremonial was reached in the early middle ages, and that after the thirteenth century it degenerated into over elaboration.[1] This ceremonial development has very largely prevailed in the Roman Church. We have but to examine the ceremonial directions of the early Roman *Ordines*,[2] and the rubrics of the Roman Missal of 1484,[3] or those of the old Carthusian Missals, and to compare them with the rubrics of the Roman Missal of Pius V. A.D. 1570, to learn how considerable this development or elaboration

[1] Lord Halifax, in *The Guardian*, Oct. 18, 1899, p. 1450. col. iii.

[2] The early Roman *Ordines* are given in Cassander, and in Hittorpius; and Mabillon has printed several of them in his *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. Duchesne also prints one of the ninth century in his *Origines du Culte Chrétien*. 2nd ed., Appendix i.

[3] Recently reprinted, under the editorship of Dr. Lippe, by the Henry Bradshaw Society.

has been. And this growing enrichment of ceremonial has not been peculiar to the Roman Church, but has been common to all parts of the universal Church. It is for this reason that the application of the term 'Catholic' to religious ceremonial is inadmissable, using that august term in its absolute sense—the sense in which we apply it to the faith. "That is Catholic, as the Greek word signifies, which is universal and general, both in time, person, and place."[1] It is impossible to say that any but very few ceremonies have been in the Church *semper*, always.

Mr. Edmund Bishop, writing as a Roman Catholic, has recently called attention to the fact of the growth of ceremonial in the Church of which he is so distinguished a layman. He says, "To represent the ceremonial of the Roman Mass of the sixth, or even the fifth century to the mind's eye is, perhaps, to-day no such easy matter, now that long habit has accustomed us to much that we view as a natural accompaniment of the service. For instance, we do not realise at once how much of added and imposing ceremonial is involved in the addition, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of the single act of the elevation of the Host and Chalice, with its accompanying lights and torches, censings, bell-ringings, and genuflections. Next, all ideas of censing the

[1] *Works of Pilkington*, Bishop of Durham, p. 548. Parker Soc.

altar, the elements for the sacrifice, or persons, are alien to the native Roman rite, and have been introduced into it from elsewhere in the course of centuries. In trying to figure to ourselves the true and unadulterated Roman ceremonial of the mass, we must conceive ritual pomp as confined to two moments: first, the entry of the celebrant into the church and up to the altar; secondly, in connection with the singing of the Gospel. . . . The ceremonial parts of the old Roman mass are over, just as the sacrifice is about to begin."[1] We have only to compare Mr. Bishop's description of the old order, with what is now seen every Sunday or high day in any Roman Catholic church, to note at once how great has been the development of ceremonial in the Roman Church. And these ceremonial developments are still in progress, some sanctioned by authority, some not. Development is a leading characteristic of the Roman Church—development of doctrine, of ritual, of ceremonial. New things in each of these three departments are constantly becoming established. The faith of the Roman Church of to-day is not the faith of the days of Pius V., neither is the ceremonial.[2]

[1] *The Genius of the Roman Rite*, pp. 10, ff.

[2] With the exception of Spain, the development of ceremonial in the Roman Church during the last three hundred years has been one long piece of degradation, consequent on the Pagan renaissance. The English Church has been saved all this, by the fixed standard of the Ornaments Rubric.

But when we turn our attention to the religious ceremonial of the English Church, a very different state of things presents itself to our notice. For the last three hundred and fifty years, ceremonial development has been rendered impossible, by reason of the very condition of things. The legalised ornaments of the church and the ministers are the ornaments of 1548–9; that is, of three and a half centuries ago. The rubrics of to-day are the rubrics practically of 1559. There is the Act of Uniformity of 1662, which bars the way to ritual if not to ceremonial development. Some persons may be ready to bewail these restrictions on ceremonial growth in the English Church. Others are to be found who, for practical reasons, do not complain; for they are convinced that, if any ceremonial developments had become authorised, the work would have been so badly done, by reason of the incompetence of the men of the times, that it would probably have to be undone. This reproach is ready to be wiped away; for there are already in our midst not a few competent liturgioligists and antiquaries, of whose learning we need not be ashamed. Until such times as these experts are called upon to advise, and the English Church is free to revise her ceremonial code, our duty is plain—it is to abide loyally and cheerfully by the ceremonial rules contained in the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.

We do not say that there is no room for some development or enrichment of English ceremonial, in regard to the rubrics of the Prayer Book; we think there is. What we do say, and say very emphatically, is, that individuals are not at liberty to introduce developments on their own private authority. We must wait till the English Church takes the initiative; and not take the law into our own hands, and so abandon the Catholic principle of obedience and conformity to lawful authority. The thirty-fourth Article speaks very plainly on this matter; "Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly, as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church." But whilst we desire a richer ceremonial, nevertheless it is true to say, that the services of the Book of Common Prayer, conducted in strict accord with the present rubrics in general, and with the accessories or ornaments enjoined by the Ornaments Rubric in particular, are not wanting in extreme dignity. Even as things are, we need not be ashamed of our lot in regard to ceremonial. The shame only comes in when the directions of the rubrics are disregarded, whether by way of subtraction or addition. Surely, there is great cause for thankfulness, that the Church of England, as far as the

ornaments of the church and clergy are concerned, appeals to the best period—the period untouched by the Pagan renaissance, which has so greatly degraded the ceremonial of the Roman Church during the last three centuries.

I.

As an instance of the growth of ceremonial in the Roman Church, we may take the subject of the altar-lights. Most of us, from what we have so often seen abroad, are familiar enough with the general appearance of a modern Roman altar. And this familiarity, strange to say, is not confined to those who have been fortunate enough to travel on the continent, and who have never been inside a Roman Catholic chapel at home: for the Roman altar, with all its adjuncts, has been only too faithfully copied in some English churches within the last fifty years or thereabouts. Prominent amongst the ornaments of the high altar of a Roman church, are the six candlesticks and candles, standing upon a shelf, and placed three on either side of the crucifix. If we enquire when these six lights were first introduced into the Roman churches, the answer seems to be, that they were first ordered in Christopher Marcellus' *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum Libri tres* (which was published at Venice in 1516[1]), for masses celebrated by

[1] This profoundly interesting work was the immediate precursor of the celebrated *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*,

a cardinal or prelate; and they seem to have been originated by one John Burchardt, of Strassburg, a man conspicuously pagan in his ideas. It is to Burchardt, that much of the elaboration of Roman ceremonial in the sixteenth century is attributable.[1]

In the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum* of Clement VIII., who was pope from 1592 to 1605, six lights (three on either side of the cross, graduating in height) are shown on the altar-

which appeared in 1600. Marcellus' *Rituum Eccles.* has, lib. iii. sect. v. cap. v. fol. cxl., the following directions *de luminaribus in capella Papæ*, "Super altare, cum divina peraguntur, sive Cardinalis, sive alius prælatus celebret, candelabra sex super altare, super credentiam vero duo cum luminaribus semper habentur: ad Evangelium luminaria duo, ad elevationem Sacramenti funalia quatuor, super cancellos capellæ, si Cardinalis celebrat, sex, si alius prælatus, quatuor funalia ardent. Si Papa celebrat, super altare candelabra septem ardent, super credentiam duo, ad Evangelium Latinum septem, ad Evangelium Grecum duo, ad elevationem Sacramenti funalia octo, super cancellos octo. Ad supplicationes Papales semper candelabra septem. Quando Papa non est præsens, duo candelabra ardent." Marcellus' work represents a use about twenty-five years earlier than 1516. It may here be said, that the real author of the *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum* is Augustinus Patricius; and that Christopher Marcellus is but the editor.

1 Burchardt was not only the all-powerful Master of Ceremonies to pope Alexander vi., at a critical period in liturgical history, but he was also the author of the *Ordo Missæ* of 1502, which was issued with the approbation of that pontiff. This work contains the first clear statement of a number of striking changes in the ceremonial of the mass, nearly all of which were subsequently incorporated in the *Missale Romanum* of pope Pius V., in 1570, and which remain to this day. In his *Ordo Missæ*, Burchardt speaks of the lights on the altar, without naming their number. The *Ordo Missæ* is printed in Cochleus, *Speculum Missæ*, Venice, 1572.

shelf in most of the many illustrations of the edition published at Paris in 1633. When the bishop himself is celebrant, seven lights are ordered — "Celebrante vero episcopo, candelabra septem super altari ponantur, quo casu crux non in medio illorum, sed ante altius candelabrum in medio cereorum positum locabitur."[1] "When the bishop celebrates, let seven candlesticks be placed upon the altar, in which case the cross shall not be set in the midst of them, but in front of the highest candlestick, which is placed in the midst of the candles."[2]

The origin of the six lights now commonly seen upon the high altar of a Roman church,

[1] *Cær. Episc.* lib. i. cap. xii. p. 69, Paris, 1633.

[2] Catalani, in commenting on this direction, writes thus: "Cur celebrante episcopo septem candelabra cum totidem cereis accensis in altari adhibeantur, ait memoratus Macrius, verbo *Candela*, alludere eum ritum ad septem illa candelabra, quæ S. Johannes vidit in sua Apocalypsi cap. i, et ad denotandum quod episcopus septem sancti Spiritus donis per ipsa candelabra significatis ornari debeat. . . . Sane Crassus lib. i. cap. xxvi.: 'Convenienter,' ait, 'per patres nostros institutum est, ut super altari celebrante episcopo, si commode poni possunt, septem luminaria æqualia tantum septem planetales stellæ apponantur; sin autem sex omnino, et non plures quam septem, nec pauciores quam sex.'"— Catalani, *Commentary on Cær. Episc.* Lib. i. cap. xii. § 12. Parisiis, 1860, tom. i. p. 254. From Catalani's *Commentary*, it will be observed that he does not there trace the origin of the seven or six lights further back than the *De Cæremoniis Cardinalium et Episcoporum* of Paris de Crassus, which appeared in the year 1564 at Venice. But he also comments on another work, frequently referred to in these pages (the *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum* of C. Marcellus, which appeared in the year 1516 at Venice), in which the seven or six lights are named. See footnote, p. 177, above.

required by the *Cæremoniale Episcoporum*, is somewhat obscure. The most probable explanation of their origin is as follows. In the eighth century it was the custom to carry the emperor's picture escorted with lights and incense,[1] and very naturally lights became part of the insignia of the pope and the bishops. In *Ordo Romanus* i., which dates from the beginning of the eighth century, we read, "Tunc subdiaconus sequens cum thumiamaterio procedit ante pontificem, mittens incensum; et septem acolythi illius regionis, cujus dies fuerit, portantes septem cereostata accensa præcedunt ante pontificem usque ante altare."[2] "Then the subdeacon, following with a censer sending forth incense, advances in front of the pope; and seven acolytes of that district, whose day it is, carrying seven candlesticks with candles lighted, go before the pope until he arrives in front of the

[1] Labbe-Cossart, *Concilia* (ed. 1729), viii. p. 705. See Mr. F. E. Brightman's article on *Byzantine Imperial Coronations*, in The Journal of Theological Studies, April, 1901. Vol. ii. No. 7. p. 365 note 1.

[2] Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, Vol. ii. p. 8. Also in an early *Ordo Romanus*, printed in Duchesne's *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 2e. ed. pp. 440, 441, the following direction as to lights is given, "Deinde oblationarius inluminat duos cereos ante secretario pro luminaria pontificis, quod est consuetudo omni tempore, et antecædit ante pontificem, et ponit eos retro altare, in duo candelabra, dextra levaque. Deinde illuminant acolithi cereostata ante secrarium et ægreditur pontifex de secrario cum diaconibus, tenentes eum duo dextra levaque, et vii cereostata procædunt ante eum et subdiaconus."

altar.[1] The earliest Roman *Ordines*, thus bear witness to the custom of escorting the pope to the altar accompanied by seven torch-bearers, whenever he performed any sacred function. The episcopal ceremonial was evidently borrowed from, and modelled upon that of the Roman Court; and for that reason seven lighted candles are still placed upon the altar, when a bishop celebrates pontifically. It seems that when the bishop was absent one candle was withdrawn, leaving but six upon the altar.[2]

It is to be noted that the practice of placing lights on the altar is not ancient; for it appears that for the first nine centuries the lights were placed on the ground: and they were not kept burning throughout the Mass, as the old Roman *Ordines* abundantly testify.[3]

[1] On the origin of the number seven in this matter, Mayer (*Explicatio Cæremoniarum Ecclesiasticarum*, Part i. cap. 3. p. 28. Tugii, 1737) has, "Septenarius autem numerus candelabrorum aut cereorum, qui in missa tantum pontificali remansit, ortus est ex septem acolythis regionariis, qui pontifici celebranti Romæ assistebant."

[2] Father Thurston, writing in *The Month*, July, 1896, p. 374, advances this, not as a certain but as a reasonably probable conclusion.

[3] "Septem igitur illa candelabra, seu cereostata, quæ ab acolythis regionariis in processione missæ pontificalis præferebantur, jam non in altari collocabantur, neque accensa per totam missam tenebantur, sed post cantatum *Kyrie eleison*, in pavimento ordinatim statuebantur, et vetustiores Romani Ordines nos docent, quorum loca descripsit Georgius in suo opere, *De Liturgia Romani Pontificis*, tom 2. lib 3. cap 2., ubi etiam scite observat, quod licet ex Romanis Ordinibus vetustioribus, erui possit, per novem

Mr. H. W. Brewer, in *The Month*,[1] remarks, "When in England the Blessed Sacrament, in its 'cupa,' or 'pyx,' was lowered on to the altar, probably the four 'serges' were also let down, and then, with the two candles already upon the altar, at High Mass, there would have been six candles on the altar; and the question suggests itself, do not the two candles pertain to the crucifix, and the other four to the Blessed Sacrament?" Mr. Brewer, however, gives no evidence in support of this theory, and the former explanation of the origin of the six lights is far more reasonable and probable.

If we go back to the beginning of the thirteenth century, we find that, whilst seven candles were carried before the pope on great occasions, as we have already said,[2] but two

priora sæcula candelabra fuisse altari imposita, certum tamen est, circum altaria, luminaria, lucernasque, oleo, et lychnis succensa, atque cerea, funalia sæculo Christi iv. adhiberi consuevisse diu noctuque micantia."—Catalani, *Sacrarum Cæremoniarum*. Lib. iii. tit. v. cap. 5. p. 397. Romæ, 1751.

"Lights on the altar," say Gasquet and Bishop (*Edward vi. and the Book of Common Prayer*, London 1890. Ch. iv. p. 59, note), "are of late medieval introduction, though the pictured representation of a single candle on the altar may be found in the twelfth and perhaps the eleventh century."

[1] Feb. 1897, p. 170.

[2] "Et ideo præferuntur duo lumina cum incenso, quia lex et prophetæ cum psalmis Christi pronuntiaverunt adventum. . . . In majoribus autem solemnitatibus septem candelabra coram pontifice deferuntur."—Innocent iii. *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. ii. cap. viii., de cereis et incenso. Innocent iii. was pope from 1198 to 1216.

lights were placed upon the altar.[1] From the footnote below, it will be be seen that, at the close of the twelfth, or beginning of the thirteenth century, considerable importance was attached to the *two* altar-lights, as their symbolic meaning shows. Had there been more than two, this meaning would have been destroyed. The two candles right and left of the altar-cross were then held to signify the joy of the two peoples, Jewish and Gentile, at the nativity of Christ. The altar-cross standing between the two candlesticks was held to signify Christ, the chief corner stone "who hath made both (peoples) one," binding the two walls of the Catholic temple of humanity into one whole.

Durandus, who was born at Puy-moisson, in

1 "Ad significandum itaque gaudiam duorum populorum, de nativitate Christi lætantium, in cornibus altaris duo sunt constituta candelabra, quæ mediante cruce, faculas ferunt accensas. Angelus enim pastoribus inquit: *Annuntio vobis gaudium magnum, quod erit omni populo, quia natus est vobis Salvator.* Hic est verus Isaac, qui risus interpretatur (Gen. xxi.). Lumen autem candelabri, fides est populi; nam ad Judaicum populum inquit propheta: *Surge, illuminare, Hierusalem, quia venit lumen tuum, et gloria Domini super te orta est* (Isai. lx.). Ad populum vero Gentilem dicit apostolus: *Eratis aliquando tenebræ, nunc autem lux in Domino* (Ephes. v.). Nam et in ortu Christi nova stella magis apparuit, secundum vaticinium Balaam: *Orietur*, inquit, *stella ex Jacob, et consurget virga ex Israel* (Num. xxiv.). Inter duo candelabra in altari crux collocatur media, quoniam inter duos populos Christus in Ecclesia mediator existit, lapis angularis, qui fecit utraque unum. Ad quem pastores a Judæa, et magi ab Oriente venerunt."—Innocent iii. *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. ii. cap. xxi.

Provence, about the year 1220, four years after the death of Innocent III. (whose testimony to the two altar-lights, we have just given[1]), became bishop of Mende in 1286. While in this post, and resident at Rome (for he did not personally visit his diocese till 1291), he finished his great work, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, which was published, as Martene observes, before 1295.[2] Thus, writing about a century later than Innocent III., Durandus says, "In cornibus altaris duo sunt candelabra constituta, ad significandum gaudium duorum populorum de Christi nativitate letantium: quæ candelabra mediante cruce faculas ferunt accensas. Angelus enim inquit pastoribus, 'Annuntio vobis gaudium magnum, quod erit omni populo, quia natus est nobis hodie Salvator mundi.' Hic est verus Isaac, qui risus interpretatur. Lumen enim candelabri fides est populi; nam ad Judaicum populum inquit propheta, 'Surge, illuminare, Hierusalem, quia venit lumen tuum, et gloria Domini super te orta est.' Ad populum vero Gentilem dicit apostolus, 'Eratis aliquando tenebræ; nunc autem lux in Domino.' Nam in ortu Christi nova stella magis apparuit, secundum vaticinium Balaam, 'Orietur,' inquit, 'stella ex Jacob, et consurget virga ex Israel.' . . . Inter duo candelabra crux in altari media collocatur:

[1] See footnote, p. 182.

[2] See *The Symbolism of Churches*, Trans. Neale and Webb, Preface, p. ix. Leeds, 1843.

quoniam inter duos populos Christus in Ecclesia mediator existit. Ipse enim est lapis angularis, qui fecit utraque unum; ad quem pastores a Judæa, et magi ab oriente venerunt."[1] "At the horns of the altar two candlesticks are placed to signify the joy of Jews and Gentiles at the nativity of Christ: which candlesticks, by means of a flint, have their wicks lighted. For the angel saith to the shepherds, 'I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people: for to you is born this day the Saviour of the world.' He is the true Isaac, which being interpreted is 'laughter.' Now, the light of the candlestick is the faith of the people. For to the Jewish people saith the prophet, 'Arise, shine, for thy light is come: and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.' But to the Gentiles the apostle saith, 'Ye were sometimes darkness, but are now light in the Lord.' For before the birth of Christ a new star appeared to the wise men, according to the prophecy of Balaam, 'There shall rise,' saith he, 'a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre out of Israel.' . . . Between the two candlesticks the cross is placed on the altar: because Christ standeth in the Church, the mediator between the two peoples. For He is the corner-stone, 'who hath made both one;' to whom the shepherds came from Judæa, and the wise men from the East."

[1] *Rationale*, lib i. cap. iii.

From this quotation, it will be seen that Durandus is simply repeating what Innocent III. had said, a hundred years before.[1] We may therefore certainly conclude that the custom of placing two lights, and two only, upon the altar, was the general practice at the beginning of the second half of the middle ages. If we go back earlier, we find a similar rule authorized. As early as the year 847, Leo IV. ordered "Let no one sing (mass) without a light, without an amice, without an albe. . . ."[2] And when we come down later, we find the same usage in vogue in England. In the Constitutions of Archbishop Walter Reynolds, A.D. 1322, we read, "Nullus clericus permittatur ministrare in officio altaris, nisi indutus sit superpellicio, et tempore quo missarum solennia peraguntur, accendantur duæ candelæ, vel ad minus una."[3] "No clerk is allowed to serve in the ministry of the altar, unless he is vested in a surplice, and at the time when the solemnities of the Mass are in progress, two candles shall be lighted, or at least one." Thus, we have testimony of the first order, that, from at least 847 until 1322,—that is, for five out of the seven centuries included in the middle ages,—*not more than two lights were placed upon the altar.* It is to

[1] See footnote, p. 182.

[2] *de Cura Pastorali*, Labb. tom. viii. col. 33.

[3] Gibson, *Codex Juris Ecclesiastici Anglicani*, Tit. xx. cap. vi. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1761.

this earlier half of the middle ages that we do well to look for ceremonial perfection.

II.

When we approach the age next preceding the Reformation, we find the same state of things in regard to the altar lights. Pugin tells us, that "till the sixteenth century, and even later, the usual number of altar-candlesticks was two, one on either side of the cross."[1] In *The Exposition of the Mass*, a later addition to Voragine's *Legenda Aurea*, edited by Mr. W. H. Frere, and recently published by the Alcuin Club, is a series of fine illustrations reproduced from the French MS., now in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. In the illustrations, two altars are depicted having two candlesticks, and nine with but one candlestick. The date of this MS. is about 1480, and the illustrations represent altars in the North of France at that time. In an edition of the *Legenda Aurea*, printed at Lyons in 1486, is a woodcut representing St. Lupus communicating King Clothair; the altar has on it

[1] *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament*, p. 47, sub 'Candlesticks.' 3rd ed. London, 1868. Pugin adds, "As is evident from illuminations and inventories, the custom of placing only two candles on the altar was by no means peculiar to the English Church. The altars depicted in early Italian frescoes, and figured in D'Agincourt's *Histoire de L'Art*, have only two candlesticks; and in a work entitled *Der weise König*, full of wood-cuts, by Hans Burgmaier, the altar, where the pope himself is celebrating, is only furnished with two candlesticks."

two small candlesticks. In Dr. Wickham Legg's paper, *On Some Ancient Liturgical Customs now falling into Disuse*[1] are given five plates, showing altars in the years 1489, 1516, 1520, 1665; in each of which two lights only are depicted. One of these illustrations shows the pope at the altar. John Myrc, in his *Instructions to Parish Priests*,[2] written probably about 1400–1450, speaks of but one light on the altar:

> Look that thy candle of wax it be,
> And set her, so that thou her see,
> On the left half of thine altar.

Thomas Becon, carries the usage of one altar-light down to Queen Mary's reign: "And because like politic and wise men ye will not stumble in your doings, but the better see what ye shall speak, ye have a candle lighted, though the day be never so fair, and the sun shine never so bright." At the conclusion of the Service, he says, "Ye put out the candle."[3] As another instance (and such might be greatly multiplied) of the use of not more than two altar-lights up to the eve of the Reformation in England, we have the statement made in *The Rites and Customs of the Monastical Church of Durham*,[4] of the practice in that church before the suppression of the Monasteries by Henry VIII. "There was perteininge to the

[1] *St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.* Vol. ii.
[2] E. E. T. Soc., p. 58.
[3] *The Displaying of the Popish Mass*, Works iii. p. 257, 282. Parker Soc.
[4] p. 8. Surtees Soc.

high altar two silver double-gilded candlesticks for two tapers, very finely wrought," and "other two silver candlesticks for everye dayes service, parcell gilt." The above quotation shows, that not only were there never more than two lights even upon the high altar at Durham, but that the mere fact of a church possessing four candlesticks or more, does not prove that they were all set upon the altar on the same occasion. We may be quite certain that, if a rich church like that at Durham had but two candlesticks on the altar, parish churches at the same date had not more. When, in the seventeenth century, Bishop Cosin gave the two fine silver candlesticks which now stand upon the altar at Durham, he simply continued the old pre-Reformation usage. If Cosin had looked to the Roman Church as his model, he would have found six candlesticks standing on a shelf or *gradin*, at that time. It is clear then, that he did not interpret the Ornaments Rubric as meaning that the current Roman number and arrangement of ornaments is to be followed in the English churches.

Mr. Cuthbert Atchley, in his exhaustive monograph, *The Ceremonial Use of Lights in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth*,[1] has proved up to the hilt, that the English custom, in the period immediately preceding the year to which the Ornaments Rubric refers,

[1] Printed in *Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book, historically considered*, Rivingtons, 1899.

was to place not more than two candles on the altar. He gives the following, amongst other examples, in support thereof.

At St. Ewen's, Bristol, in 1455 there were "two candlesticks of latten for the high altar."[1]

At Wickham, one of the prebendal churches of St. Paul's Cathedral, the visitors found in 1458, "two candlesticks of latten standing before the altar, and two candlesticks standing upon the altar."[2]

In 1466, the Church of St. Stephen, Coleman Street, London, had "a pair of candlesticks to set on the high altar."[3]

At Wing, Bucks, they had in 1527, "two standards of latten for the high altar; and two small latten candlesticks for the same."[4]

The White Monks of Delacres, Staffordshire, at the dissolution of their house in 1538, had "two candlesticks of latten on the altar."[5] As we have already seen, this was the case at Durham at the same date.

At St. Margaret's, Westminster, in 1549, the second year of Edward VI., there were "two candlesticks of silver, parcel gilt, weighing 45 ounces, and a candlestick for the high altar,

1 *Bristol and Gloucestershire Archæol. Soc. Trans.* 1890–91; xv. 152.

2 *Visitation of Churches belonging to St. Paul's Cathedral*, Camden Soc. 1895; p. 95.

3 *Archæologia*, 1887; i. 34.

4 Ibid. 1855; xxxvi. 222.

5 Ibid. 1866; xliii. 215.

of copper and gilt."[1] This latter, as at Durham, may have been for "every day service."[2]

This usage, of not placing more than two lights on the altar, prevailed in the second year of King Edward VI. If there were other lights *around* the altar according to the size and wealth of the church, *on* the altar there were but two at the most. The inference is irresistible, namely, that more than two lights on the altar can only be used in disregard of the directions of the Ornaments Rubric.[3] Moreover, as a lesser consideration, though a not unimportant one, the use of but two lighted candles on the altar enables us still to claim the most beautiful symbolic meaning, given centuries ago by Innocent III. and Durandus, to which we have referred in the course of this article.

[1] Walcott, *The History of the Parish Church of St. Margaret, in Westminster*, 1847, pp. 68, 69.

[2] See p. 188.

[3] "We know now that not more than two lights were set on the altar in the second year of the reign of Edward vi.; and, if we are not lawless, we shall not have any more now."—Atchley, *The Ceremonial Use of Lights in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth*, in "Some Principles and Services of the Prayer Book," p. 38, Rivingtons, 1899. In the same work, Mr. Comper, in an article upon *The English Altar and its Surroundings*, pp. 68, ff., comes to the same conclusion as Mr. Atchley. Both these writers speak with the authority belonging to men who have only given an impartial verdict after most exhaustive research.

III.

The use of six lights on the altar of an English church is obviously a wide departure from old English and medieval precedent, in favour of a servile copying of modern Roman custom. The Roman rubrics as to the number of lights are as follows: "Super altare collocetur crux in medio, et candelabra saltem duo cum candelis accensis hinc, et inde in utroque ejus latere."[1] "Upon the altar a cross shall be placed in the centre, and at least two candlesticks with lighted candles in corresponding places on each side of it." This order is, in practice, interpreted to direct, that "Two, and not more than two, candles may be lighted at a priest's Low Mass, unless Mass be said for the parish, or for a convent, or on one of the greater solemnities, when four candles may be used (plus quam duo, according to a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites; *Manuale*, n. 377). Six candles are lighted at High Mass, seven at the Mass of a bishop."[2]

[1] *Rubricæ generales Missalis*, xx. 1.

[2] Addis and Arnold, *A Catholic Dictionary*, 1893, sub 'Candles and Lights,' p. 111. Compare with this, however, Falise, *Cérémonial Romain*, p. 348, § 9, "Il est d'ailleurs défendu aux prêtres, aux curés, pour la messe paroissiale, même aux vicaires généraux, d'employer quatre chandeliers pour leurs messes: cela n'est permis qu'aux évêques, aux cardinaux, et aussi aux abbés lorsqu'ils célèbrent pontificalement—Congrégation des Rites."

The Roman rules as to candles on the altar are very confusing. We believe that we are right in saying, that it is

We conclude this essay by quoting the words of an article already referred to in the foregoing pages. "The ceremonialists of a few years ago made a great mistake in introducing the custom of placing six lights on the altar (or rather on the gradin); it is a mistake, whether looked at from a legal, or historical, or politic, or æsthetic, point of view. If we are to return to mediæval ceremonial, the six lights on the altar must be the first things to be laid aside." [1]

only by custom that a priest is allowed six lights at high mass; and that the rule really is, seven lights for a bishop when celebrating pontifical high mass in his own diocese; six lights for a bishop when celebrating high mass otherwise; four lights for a priest's high mass, or a bishop's low mass; two lights for a priest's low mass.

[1] *'Mediæval' Ceremonial*, The Ch. Quar. Review, Jan. 1900. Vol. xlix. pp. 405, 406.

NOTE I.—"As regards the rule of the English Church concerning the limitation of the altar-lights to two, it is sometimes stated that the exceptions have more to be said in their favour, at least as illustrating cathedral use, than is always allowed; and it is said that in large and important churches two or four extra lights may lawfully be placed on the altar. But were it much more clear than it is that the rules for secular cathedral churches, such as Lincoln, Chichester, and Salisbury, absolutely prove that more than two candles, the number varying according to the rank of the day, were in use upon the high altars of these churches, not only in the early thirteenth century, the date of their consuetudinaries, but in 1548, it gives us no authority for the introduction of more than two lights upon any altars but those of the secular cathedral churches in question. . . . The rule binding other churches, no matter what their size or wealth, is not touched by these examples; and it would seem that the only exceptions known in favour of many lights upon the altar are those of the chapels royal upon state occasions. And yet it cannot be pleaded that the limitation of the number of the altar lights in other cases was due to poverty, when, for instance, we bear in mind the minute particulars given in *The Rites of Durham*. Even that vast and wealthy church had never more than two candlesticks upon the high altar at one time, although possessing two pairs of varying richness for separate use, according to the rank of the day (See *Rites of Durham*, Surtees Soc. p. 8). It was, at least as far as monastical and parish churches are concerned, whether these churches were great or small, double gilding and very fine workmanship which marked the difference between the feast day and the work day, between the high altar and other altars, between a wealthy church and a poor one; and not an increase in the number of the candlesticks."—J. N. Comper, *The Reasonableness of the Ornaments Rubric, etc.*, St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Transactions, Vol. iv. pp. 75, 76.

NOTE II.—"There is a curious legend, met with nearly everywhere, that the Privy Council has forbidden the setting of the candlesticks directly on the altar, without the intervention of a shelf. In the Report, however, of the Committee of the Alcuin Club against the lawfulness of

the gradin, they mention the opinion of Sir Walter Phillimore, which it may be hoped will finally lay the ghost to rest. He says: 'No Court has decided that it is illegal to put candlesticks directly on the *mensa*' (Alcuin Club Tracts, i. 64).—*Mediæval Ceremonial*, The Ch. Quar. Review, Jan. 1900. Vol. xlix. pp. 406, 407, n.

The Silken Chalice-Veil.

Archbishop Benson's interpretation of the dictum, "Omission is not prohibition," pp. 197, 198; which excludes the use of the silken chalice-veil, pp. 198, 199. Mr. St. John Hope's statement, p. 199. Mr. Cuthbert Atchley's opinion, pp. 200—202. The offertory-veil, p. 203. The corporas, pp. 204—206. Roman rules, pp. 206. The silken chalice-veil modern in the Roman Church, pp. 207, 208; its probable origin traced, pp. 208—212. The silken chalice-veil unauthorised in the English Church, p. 213. The use of the offertory-veil, ibid.

IX.

THE SILKEN CHALICE-VEIL.

IN a former article, we made some remarks upon the dictum, "Omission is not prohibition." We suggested that this dictum is one which has certain well defined limitations. Without these limitations, it may be used to justify all manner of ceremonial irregularities. In the Lincoln Judgment, Archbishop Benson alluded to the dictum, "Omission is not prohibition," in treating of the use of the sign of the cross in giving the absolution and the benediction. His words were, "The argument that the 'omission of a direction is not a prohibition,' has no meaning except in cases where it is also shewn that something has been omitted. To give it force in this case, it must appear at the least that this gesture was prescribed in the English Church up to the time of the Reformation, and that her bishops and clergy continued to use it in giving the absolution or benediction, as it were traditionally and without correction. Before the very word 'omission' becomes applicable or requires to be considered at all, it must at least be shewn, in order to uphold a ceremonial practice in the

English Church Service, that the practice is one continued from our own earlier services. An observance, however widespread, if borrowed and introduced from foreign usages, or from a liturgy or rubric unknown to this country, cannot be treated as 'omitted.'"[1] We may put Archbishop Benson's opinion into other words, and say, If an ornament or a gesture can be proved to have existed in the pre-Reformation Church in England, there is *prima facie* ground for enquiring whether or not it has been abolished by authority. If it has not been abolished, then there may be good reasons for retaining and continuing such ornament or ceremony. But if it was unknown to the ancient Church of England, there is no need for further enquiry: the thing is an innovation, and to be shunned on the score of lack of authority. Archbishop Benson's judgment in this particular was pre-eminently sane, and it is worthy of careful attention.

I.

There is a certain ornament or vesture of the church which, in recent years, has been brought into use in a multitude of English churches, which is excluded according to Archbishop's Benson's interpretation of the dictum, "Omission is not prohibition." We refer to the square veil of silk, used to cover

[1] *The Bishop of Lincoln's Case*, p. 172. Roscoe, Clowes and Sons, Lond. 1891.

the sacred vessels when carried in and out of the church, commonly called the chalice-veil. This silken veil is used as we have said, and also for covering the chalice and paten until the offertory.

In order to establish the legality of the silken chalice-veil, it is necessary to enquire if it was in use in this Church of England during the year to which the Ornaments Rubric directs us,—the second year of King Edward VI. If it was legalised in that year, it is allowed: if it cannot be shewn to have been legalised in that year, it is disallowed. The question before us is one of the many in which it is necessary to consult the antiquaries. The appeal of the Ornaments Rubric is to history, and not to sentiment.

Mr. W. H. St. John Hope, who is well known for his wide acquaintance with English Inventories, said recently, "After reading through hundreds and hundreds of English parish church inventories, I have no recollection of ever coming across such an ornament as the silken chalice-veil of to-day."[1] This is very strong testimony, coming from such a source, and we cannot ignore its force. If the use of the silken chalice-veil had been common before the Reformation, it is quite impossible that it should have been omitted from the very many inventories of church goods to which we have access. Their silence is conclusive of the fact

[1] *The Church Times*, Feb. 16, 1900.

that such a thing was not in use in the second year of King Edward VI.[1]

In the Inventory of the Vestry in Westminster Abbey, taken in 1388, whilst there were ten corporas cases, all embroidered, there seem, however, to be no ornaments in the inventory that can be identified with a modern chalice-veil. The nearest approach to a cloth that could be used for this purpose is the *sudarium*, with which the elements were covered when they were carried to the altar, and in which the paten was wrapped when held by the sub-deacon during the Canon. When we consider the extraordinary number of vestures named in this Inventory in great detail, the absence of any mention of chalice-veils is very significant.[2]

Mr. Cuthbert Atchley, whose extensive knowledge of ceremonial matters entitles him to be heard, has lately said, "The Ornaments Rubric requires the use of such ornaments as were in this Church of England in 2 Ed. VI. The only veils which are mentioned by rubrics in connection with the sacred vessels are the pair of corporasses and an *offertorium* or patener's veil. The rules in vogue then with regard to the material of the corporas are as follows:—

[1] The writer was recently informed, that two Jesuit fathers, after some search, were not a little astonished at finding no evidence for the silken veil in England before the year 1549. They appealed to an eminent English antiquary, who was only able to say that the English antiquaries had arrived at the same result.

[2] See *Archæologia*, 1890. Vol. lii. part 1. p. 202.

It may not be silken cloth, nor coloured, but must be of pure linen, made of flax, and hallowed by a bishop.[1] To which Lindewode adds, that it must not be starched, nor have anything put into it to make it stand stiff over the chalice; but of pure linen without the admixture of anything else, whether of greater or of less value.[2] From all of which it is evident that the corporas might only be of linen, and not of silk. The regulations as to the material of the corporas were included among those canons, constitutions, ordinances, etc., that were invigorated with the force of statute law by Henry VIII. The suggestion that the chalice-veil of modern Roman use is evolved from the patener's veil is hardly tenable. That was a *sudarium*[3] to protect the chalice and paten

[1] This rule is usually referred to Eusebius and Sylvester, Decr. iii. de Cons. Di. i. cap. 46. It runs as follows, "Consulto omnium statuimus, ut sacrificium altaris non in serico panno, aut tincto quisquam celebrare presumat: sed in puro linteo ab episcopo consecrato, terreno scilicet lino procreato, atque contesto: sicut corpus Domini nostri Jesu Christi in sindone linea munda sepultum fuit."

[2] "Corporalia non debent fieri ex serico, sed solum ex panno lineo puro terreno ab episcopo consecrato. Nec debet confici neque benedici *Corporale* de panno misso in confectionem farinæ, vel alterius rei ad hoc, quod stet rigidum super calicem; sed erit de lino puro absque mixtione alterius rei, sive pretiosioris, sive vilioris."—Lindewode, *Provinciale*, lib. iii. tit. 23. De celeb. miss.: cap. Linteamina, sub *corporalia*. Oxoniæ, 1679. col. 235.

[3] "The sudary was a scarf of silk or linen which was cast about the shoulders, and in the ends of which the hands of those who carried certain objects ceremonially were muffled. In quires it was used by the patener or third minister, when he brought in the chalice and when he held up the paten. But

from the moisture of the hands of the person carrying it; and it was not used by the priest. The chalice-veil, on the contrary, is never used as a *sudarium*, but is in use analagous to

in parish churches its chief use was to carry the chrismatory at the solemn processions to the font at Easter. When not of linen, it seems to have usually been made of some old stuff of little worth."—Micklethwaite, *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 34. Alcuin Club Tracts. i.

The Sarum directions were, that the *offertorium*, or offertory veil, and the corporasses be placed in the chalice, and be carried in by the collet vested in alb and silk mantle. Later on, in the Service, the paten wrapped in the *offertorium* is to be given to the collet to hold (Vide *The Use of Sarum*, Frere, i. 69, 79.) At Lincoln, the epistoler brought in the chalice, holding it with a sudary. The gospeller and his fellow-deacons, after the *Sanctus*, carried in the paten wrapped in a sudary, and gave it to the epistoler to hold during the canon. (Vide *Statutes of Lincoln Cathedral*, H. Bradshaw and Chr. Wordsworth, Vol. i. pp. 378, 380.) The *sudarium* and the *offertorium* were evidently identical, having no connection with the linen corporas.

In the South Kensington Museum is an offertory veil, 7792., of the fifteenth century, made of gold thread and velvet: it measures 14 feet 4 inches in length, by 1 foot 10 inches in width. Another, 7799., of later date, is of crimson velvet, measuring 11 feet 2 inches in length, by 1 foot 10 inches in width. Each of these offertory veils has a fringe of gold at the ends. (Vide Chambers, *Divine Worship in England*, p. 274). See pp. 209, 210, note [3], later in this essay.

In the Inventory of the Vestry in Westminster Abbey, taken in 1388, occurs, "Item unus casus de panno rubio aureo cum duobus sudarijs de panno albo vocato tartaryn pro oblacione facienda et pro patena tenenda per predictum R. T. ad utramque missam assignatus."—*Archæologia*, 1888. Vol. lii. part i. p. 270. Amongst the Lent stuff of the Dissolution, were, "Oon corporas case with corporaces. ij white sydaryes" (Invent. 1540. Ibid.) Here the distinction between the corporas and the sudary is marked. The difference is again proved by consulting Dugdale's Inventory of St. Paul's Cathedral, A.D. 1295, pp. 216, 217. in which Corporalia and Offertoria are given under different headings.

(and probably homogenous with) a corporas."[1] The modern silken chalice-veil is not used to protect the sacred vessels from the hands; it is merely used to cover the vessels. It is in no sense to be confused with the sudarium, patener's veil, offertorium, or humeral veil: it is a different vesture, used for a different purpose, by a different minister. In the Roman Church to-day, the silken chalice-veil and the humeral veil are different ornaments. To show the distinction between the two ornaments, it is not necessary to go further than the *Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ* of the Roman Missal; in which the humeral veil is distinctly ordered. "Diaconus amovet calicem, si est in altari, vel si est in credentia, ut magis decet, accipit eum de manu subdiaconi, qui illum cum patena, et hostia coopertum palla, et velo a collo sibi pendente, manu sinistra tenens, et alterum manum superponens velo, ne aliquid decidat, de credentia detulit."[2] "The deacon moves the chalice aside, if it is on the altar, or if it is on the credence, as is more seemly, receiving it from the hand of the subdeacon, who, with the paten and host, covered with the pall and with the veil hanging from his neck, holds it with his left hand, and placing the other hand upon the veil, lest anything fall, carries it from the credence."

[1] *The Church Times*, Feb. 23, 1900.

[2] Ritus celeb. Miss. vii. 9. *Missale Romanum*, Venice, 1713.

The ancient rule is, as we have said, that the corporasses should be of pure white linen, and of no other fabric. The reason why the corporas should be of linen only, is because it signifies the linen cloths in which our Saviour's body was wrapped in the tomb.[1] This rule that the corporas be only of linen is very ancient indeed.

Originally, there was but one very large linen corporas, so large in fact, that it not only enveloped the altar in its ample folds, but also was turned up to cover the oblations.[2] In process of time, and for convenience sake, this ample corporal was divided into two—the larger half being used to consecrate upon as before, the smaller half being used to cover the chalice. This distinction is noted as early as about the year 1100, by St. Anselm, who says, "Whilst consecrating, some cover the chalice with the corporal, others with a folded cloth."[3]

[1] "Corporale erit candidum atque mundum, quia significat sidonem, in qua corpus Christi fuit involutum.—Lindewode, *Provinciale*, lib. iii. tit. 23, sub *corporalia*.

[2] In describing the ceremonial of the early Roman Church, Mr. Bishop says, "In those days a corporal was a cloth large enough to cover the altar. An acolyte stands holding the chalice with the corporal laid upon it; he hands the corporal to a deacon, who, with another deacon, mounts to the altar, one standing at either end; the deacon begins to unfold the corporal, throws one end of it to the other deacon, and so they spread it out over the altar; just what may be seen done any day in the laying of a table cloth."—*The Genius of the Roman Rite*, p. 12. See the next essay on The Chalice-Pall.

[3] *Opera*, 138. c. 4.

A similar distinction is made by Innocent III. (1198–1216), who says, "Duplex enim est palla, quæ dicitur *corporale*, una quam diaconus super altare totam extendit, altera quam super calicem plicatam imponit."[1] "The cloth which is called the *corporal* is two-fold, one which the deacon entirely spreads upon the altar, the other which he places folded upon the chalice." Durandus, writing a century later, uses the same words.[2] Thenceforward this usage prevailed. This accounts for the fact, that, in the old inventories, we constantly find the corporasses named in pairs,[3] which were kept folded up, when not in use, in a forel or burse.[4] Whilst the burse was covered with

[1] *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. ii. cap. 55.

[2] *Rationale*, lib. iv. cap. 29.

[3] The Constitutions of the Bishops of Worcester in 1226 and 1240, required that in every church should be provided *duo paria corporalium*, and the Synod of Exeter in 1287, ordained that in every church should be *duo corporalia cum repositoriis* (Wilkins, *Conc.* i. 623, 666, ii. 139). The *repositorium*, or case wherein the corporasses were enclosed, when not in use, was richly embroidered, or adorned with precious stones; it was termed likewise *theca*, *capsa*, *bursa corporalium*. Vide *Promptorium Parvulorum*, p. 94 n. Camden Soc.

[4] At St. Paul's Cathedral in 1295, there were 'alia capsa breudata cum corporalibus." This entry occurs four times. —Dugdale, pp. 216, 217. In the year 1485, there were at St. Margaret's, Southwark, amongst other ornaments, "A corporas cace of blacke clothe of gold, with blacke byrdes ther on, and with iij knoppes of perle thereon and the corperas. A case for a corperas of blew clothe of gold with the corperas. Seven casys for a corperas of dyuyrs sylkys with the corporas."—*British Magazine*, 1848. Vol. xxxiii. p. 16. In 1552, the sixth year of the reign of Edward vi., there were at Wycombe, Bucks, "Item vij casis and xj corporas

silk, velvet, or other rich material, embroidered back and front, the corporasses were always of pure linen, neither dyed nor coloured in any way.[1] If there were rare exceptions, this was the general rule. It is not by rare exceptions, but by the general rule, that we are to be guided.

II.

When we come to examine the rubrics of the Roman Missal, we find there, that the priest is directed to place over the sacred vessels a

clothis :" in 1518, "Item iiij Corpaxes w^t^ casys :" in 1547, "Item a masse booke w^t^ a corporas case and ij corporasses therein."—*Records of Bucks*, Vol. viii. No. 2, pp. 128, 142, 144.

In addition to the names for the burse, given in a previous note, it was also called *corporax*; e.g. "the holie Corporax Cloth, which was within the *corporax*, wherewith Saint Cuthbert did cover the chalice, when he used to say masse."—*Rites of Durham*, p. 20. Surtees Soc. Another name for the burse was *corporal*; e.g. At Pembroke College, Cambridge, after a list of eight or nine 'corporals' of rich material, we read, "and all these have linen cloths within." —Hist. MSS. Comm. Rep. i. Appendix, 72. At St. Stephen's, Coleman St., there were in 1542, "xj Corporis, and in eache of them a corporis clothe."—*Archæologia*, 1887. Vol. l. pt. i. 48.

In 1544, at Leverton, there was "payd for sylk for mekyng off on pursse for to bere the sakarment in to seke folke. vijd." (*Archæologia*, 1867. vol. xli. pt. ii. p. 356.) It seems that sometimes the Eucharist was enfolded in one of the corporasses, and carried thus in the burse to the sick. This explains the use of the word *corporax*, to denote the burse.

1 "Corporalem Pallam non de serico aut de tincto peu operibus variato, sed solum de simplici albo panno lineo, fieri prohibemus, præcipientes ut munda et bene composita et plicata est."—Ducange, sub voce. 2. *Palla.*

silken veil,[1] covered with which they are carried to, and placed upon the altar.[2] The chalice-veil is not removed till the offertory.[3]

This represents the custom which has of late years been faithfully copied in certain English churches. It is quite evident where the model in this matter has been sought, namely, in the ceremonial of the Roman Church of modern times, as laid down in the rubrics of the Roman Missal.

It is to be observed that the silken chalice-veil is, comparatively speaking, a modern ornament in the Roman Church. In the *Ordo Missæ* of John Burchardt (circ. 1502), no mention is made of the silken chalice-veil. The following is his account of the final preparations of the celebrant, before leaving the sacristy. When he has vested and is about to proceed to the altar, "accipit manu sinistra calicem cum patena simul ligata, . . . et desuper ponit bursam cum corporali, et palla, quæ debent esse de puro panno lineo, non de panno intincto, aut de serico; et bursam ipsam, ne cadet manu dextera tenens, cooperto capite

[1] "Deinde præparat calicem, super ejus os ponit purificatorium mundum, et super illud patenam cum hostia integra . . . et eam tegit parva palla linea, tum velo serico: super velo ponit bursam coloris paramentorum."—*Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ.* i. 1.

[2] "Tum ascendit ad medium altaris, ubi ad cornu Evangelii sistit calicem, extrahit corporale de bursa, quod extendit in medio altaris, et super illud calicem velo coopertum collocat."—Ibid. ii. 2.

[3] "Dicto *Offertorio*, discooperit calicem."—Ibid. vii. 2.

accedit ad altare:"[1] "he takes in his left hand the chalice with the paten attached to it, . . . and on top of it the burse with the corporal and pall, and these last ought to be of pure white linen, not of dyed cloth or of silk, and holding the burse with his right hand lest it should fall, he advances to the altar with his head covered." On arriving at the altar, "explicat corporale, et calicem de suo sacculo solvit:"[2] "he unfolds the corporas, and takes the chalice out of its bag." At the end of Mass, the following directions are given by Burchardt: "Minister accipit candelas de altari, et extinguit eas. Celebrans plicat corporale, palla interposita, reponit eam in bursam corporalis, et calicem cum patena in sacculum, sive linteum ad hoc ordinatum ligat, ponit desuper bursam cum corporali, et omnia in manum sinistram recipiens, manu dextera retinet bursam corporalis ne cadat."[3] "The server takes the candles from the altar and extinguishes them. The celebrant folds up the corporas, the pall being put within, he replaces it in the corporas-case, and ties up the chalice with the paten in the bag, or towel provided for this purpose, he places the burse with the corporas upon the top, and taking the whole in the left hand, holds the corporas-case with the right hand lest it fall." The bag named by Burchardt

[1] *Ordo Missæ*, sub 'Ad Casulam.' in Cochleus, p. 198 *b*. Venice, 1572.

[2] Ibid. p. 199.

[3] Ibid. p. 220 *b*.

clearly excludes the use of any chalice-veil, and indeed no trace of such a thing is to be found in the illuminations or engravings of the period, which, be it observed, falls within fifty years of the year to which we are referred in the Ornaments Rubric.[1]

In the directions at the end of Mass, given by Christopher Marcellus, no mention of a chalice-veil is made: "Subdiaconus vero accipit calicem, mundat, et aptat cum patena et purificatorio, plicat corporalia, ponit in bursam, imponit supra calicem, et omnia simul portat ad credentiam."[2] "The subdeacon takes the chalice, cleanses it, and covers it with the paten and purificatory, folds the corporasses, puts them in the burse, places it upon the chalice, and carries the whole together to the credence."[3]

[1] As evidence of the late introduction of the chalice-veil in the Roman churches, we may refer to the frontispiece of the Carthusian Missals of 1679, 1713, and 1771. The celebrant is depicted standing in the front of the North part of the altar, facing South, at the beginning of the Service: the chalice with the paten on the top is clearly visible, and it has no chalice-veil. As late as the year 1771 the chalice-veil was not therefore in use amongst the Carthusians: but the writer is unable to say if it has since been adopted.

[2] *Rituum Ecclesiasticorum*, lib. ii. cap. ii. fol. lxxii. Venice, 1516.

[3] It is very interesting to observe, that C. Marcellus, in the year 1516, and Paris de Crassus, in the year 1564, both refer to the use of the *offertorium* or *sudarium* at the Offertory; whilst neither of these writers allude to the chalice-veil in its modern form. "Interim etiam paratus, subdiaconus ante credentiam cum velo circa collum, et inde accipit calicem cum patena, hostia, et palla; et cooperitur cum velo."—C. Marcellus, *Rituum Ecclesias-*

In the *Carthusian Ordinary* of 1582, we find named what appears to be the *linteum* or towel, referred to above by Burchardt. Amongst the instructions to the sacristan occurs, ". . . sit linteum super piscinam pro suscipiendo calice ante principium et post finem missæ;" and also, ". . . . mapulæ quibus involvuntur calices."[1] "Let there be a towel upon the piscina for taking the chalice before the beginning and after the end of Mass" . . . "the napkins in which the chalices are wrapt."

From the evidence afforded by the *Ordo Missæ* of Burchardt, to which we have referred, it seems highly probable that the "sacculum, sive linteum" ("the bag, or towel"), of which he speaks, is the original of the modern Roman silken chalice-veil; in fact that the chalice-veil is but an ornamental form of Burchardt's bag. We know that the maniple was originally a cloth or handkerchief intended merely for use, and not for ornament; which afterwards assumed a purely decorative and symbolic form. Is it not possible that a similar process went on with regard to the chalice-bag, to which Burchardt refers? In his arrangement of the

ticorum, lib. ii. cap. ii. fol. lxxi. Venice, 1516. "Lecto offertorio, illico [subdiaconus] vadit ad abacum, ubi velo super humeris ejus extenso, capit dextra manu calicem cum patena, hostia, palla, et purificatorio, quæ omnia simul extremitate ipsius veli cooperta, . . ."—Paridis Crassi, *De Cæremoniis Card. et Episc.* lib. i. cap. vi. fol. 9 *a*. Venice, 1582.

[1] *Ordinarium Cartusiense*, cap xxiii. §§ 51, 41. Parisiis, 1582.

vessels, it closely corresponds with the modern chalice-veil; and it would require no great alteration to remove the string used for tying it, and to make it of richer material. This theory would explain accurately the three cloths now used about the chalice in the Roman Church: (1) the corporas cloth, to lie on the altar, much in its old state, but somewhat reduced in size, (2) the corporas cloth to cover the chalice, much reduced in size and stiffened, called the pall, (3) the silken veil, an ornamental development of the bag in which the chalice used to be kept. This theory of the origin of the silken chalice-veil removes the difficulty which has been felt in accepting the idea, that the chalice-veil is an enriched form of the covering corporas cloth: for the following reasons—(1) the covering corporas cloth can be traced in the small stiff pall, which it is in reality, (2) in the Roman Church, even in Burchardt's *Ordo Missæ*, no less than in England, the making of a silken corporas cloth was forbidden by the canon law. The theory of the evolution of the silken chalice-veil out of the chalice-bag, removes all the difficulties which have been felt in identifying the chalice-veil with the corporas; and, as regards the position in England, we can definitely say that no such development ever took place. The use of the words *corporas* and *corporal* for 'burse'[1] covers all the cases of silk cor-

[1] See p. 206, note.

porasses named in inventories, which are very few indeed, allowing for an occasional real corporas cloth of silk as an abuse. The slovenliness of medieval Low Mass seems to be responsible for this development of the silk chalice-veil out of the chalice-bag. Medieval people were at the same time greasy-fingered, and they were particularly careful to use a cloth or towel of some kind in handling the church-plate. At High Mass, they used the sudary to carry the things in; but at Low Mass, on the continent, it would seem from Burchardt's words, that the bag, in which the chalice and paten were kept in the sacristy, was used to carry in the vessels to the altar. Inventories show that chalices were kept in bags when out of use;[1] so were silver candlesticks, and censers. There is nothing in the Ornaments Rubric to prevent our keeping the altar-vessels in wash-leather bags in the cupboard or safe of the sacristy; but by no stretch of imagination can that rubric be made to sanction carrying the vessels to the altar in such bags, or in any foreign form or development of the same. The chalice-bag was not an ornament of the Church of England in the

[1] In certain instructions for the better rule of the Cistercian monasteries in Scotland, given in the year 1531, occurs, "Omnes calices sacculis lineis honestis et mundis involvantur."— *Illustrations of the Topography and Antiquities of the shires of Aberdeen and Banff*, Aberdeen, Spalding Club, 1842, vol. iv. pp. x, and 7.

second year of Edward VI., at any time of the priest's ministration.

We conclude our observations by repeating, that the silken chalice-veil, not being a legalised ornament of the English Church in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., and not having since that time been authorised in England, its use amongst us cannot be justified. If it is desired to cover the holy vessels in carrying them in to the altar, it should be done by using a large and long offertory veil,[1] at the principal celebration of the Eucharist: but there is no objection, on the score of irreverence, to carrying them in uncovered, the burse containing the pair of corporasses being laid on the top of the paten.

[1] See pp. 201, 202, n. [3]. Offertory veils may be had from the St. Dunstan Society, 102 Adelaide Road, London, N.W. This Society exists for the purpose of making vestments and ornaments, in accordance with the standard set forth by the Ornaments Rubric of the Church of England; and turns out most excellent work.

The Chalice-Pall.

The use of the foreign stiffened chalice-pall not permissible in the English Church, p. 217. The ancient rule as to the chalice-covering, pp. 217, 218. Evasion of the Roman rules abroad, pp. 218, 219. Use of the corporas to cover the chalice, p. 219. The use of cardboard about the Blessed Sacrament not reverent, p. 220. Rules as to the corporasses, pp. 221, 222. Dominican directions, pp. 222, 223. Conclusion, pp. 224, 225.

X.

THE CHALICE-PALL.

TAKING the Ornaments Rubric as our guide, as we are bound to do, the custom of using a small stiffened pall or corporas, for covering the chalice is prohibited. Such a thing was unknown in this Church of England in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. It has not since been authorised in the English Church, and we may express the hope that it never will be. Mr. St. John Hope, the eminent antiquary, whose knowledge of church inventories is unrivalled, has recently said, "After reading through hundreds and hundreds of English parish church inventories, I have no recollection of ever coming across such an ornament as the pasteboard-stiffened small corporas or 'pall.'"[1]

I.

The ancient rule is that the corporas, wherewith the chalice is covered, should be of pure linen; it must not be starched, nor have anything put into it to make it stand stiff or rigid over the chalice; it must be simply linen

[1] *The Church Times*, Feb. 16, 1900.

without the admixture of anything else, of greater or of less value.[1] Now the Roman rubrics order the priest, in preparing the vessels, to place over the mouth of the chalice a purificatory, and upon these the paten with a wafer laid therein, next, to place over the paten and wafer a small linen pall — *parva palla linea*.[2] It is to be observed that the Roman rubric requires the pall to be of linen, but the force of this injunction is very widely evaded on the continent, as the following passage from Boissonet shows. "La pale est une pièce de toile semblable à celle du corporal, destinée à couvrir le calice. En France, on y insère un carton pour la rendre plus facile à manier."[3] "The pall is a piece of linen-cloth, like that of the corporas, intended to cover the chalice. In France, a piece of cardboard is inserted to make it easier to handle." Le Vavasseur

[1] Lindewode, *Provinciale*, lib. iii. tit. 23. qu. p. 201 note 2, of the previous essay.

[2] "Deinde præparat calicem, super ejus os ponit purificatorium mundum, et super illud patenam cum hostia integra . . . et eam tergit parva palla linea."—*Ritus servandus in celebratione Missæ*, i. 1. Missale Romanum, Venice, 1713.

[3] *Dictionnaire des Cérémonies*, Vol. ii. col. 1134. Paris, 1848.

"*Palla*, Corporale minus, quo tegitur calix; le petit corporal, carré de lin soutenu par un carton dont on couvre le calice, la palle."—Ducange, *Lexicon Manuale*, sub 'Palla.' col 1594. Paris, 1866.

"La pale doit être de toile aussi bien au-dessus qu'en dessous. . . . On peut introduire entre les deux toiles un mince carton, mais il est mieux de n'employer qu'un simple carré de toile double empesée et consistante."—*Cérémonial Romain*, par L'Abbé Falise. p. 344.

also says, "En Italie, la pale consiste dans une double toile empesée, coupée en carré et sans carton. En France, on met un carton entre les deux toiles. Cet usage n'est pas réprouvé, comme on peut le voir dans la *Correspondance de Rome*. La pale était d'abord une partie même du corporal, qui se repliait sur le calice, comme le font encore les Chartreuse."[1] "In Italy, the pall consists of a double linen-cloth starched, cut square, and without any cardboard. In France, a piece of cardboard is inserted between the two pieces of linen-cloth. This custom is not disapproved of, as may be seen in the *Correspondance de Rome*. The pall was at first a part of the corporas itself, which was folded back over the chalice, as is still done by the Chartreuse."[2] De Moleon, who wrote in the eighteenth century, describes the use of the corporas in covering the chalice instead of the pall, to have been retained at Rouen, Orleans, Lyons, and

[1] *Cérémonial selon le Rit Romain d'après Baldeschi*, part i. § i. ch. iv. Paris, 1871.

[2] "Tunc faciens crucem cum ipso calice . . . ponit eum super corporale in medio, et hostiam collocat ante calicem, quem postea superiore corporalis parte cooperit: imposita prius patena ex majori parte subtus corporale ad manum dexteram." ". . . accipit calicem utraque manu, eumque parum elevat, primum retractis paululum corporalibus." ". . . offertorio dictis, removet superiorem corporalis partem versus dorsum altaris."—*Ordinarium Cartusiense*, cap xxvi. § 20; cap. xxvii. § 6; cap. xxxii. § 10. Parisiis, 1582. For a similar use amongst the Dominicans, the Cistercians, and the Benedictines, see later in this essay, pp. 222, 223.

other great churches in France.[1] So that even abroad the use of the stiffened or cardboard pall, covered with linen, is not fully sanctioned. It is well known that cardboard is very frequently made of old rags. Such a material, even if hidden from sight by a linen case, is a horrible abomination when used to cover the sacred vessels and the Consecrated Species.[2] It is impossible to conceive of irreverence pushed to greater extreme than to use such a thing for so sacred a purpose, quite apart from the fact that it is happily unauthorised. Yet, incredible though it may seem, this outlandish stiffened pall has been introduced wholesale into many of our English churches, in pure imitation of a degraded foreign custom!

Mr. Mickethwaite observes, "The square of pasteboard cased in linen, which has been introduced from abroad into some of our churches lately, and is called a pall, has no English authority, and the use of pasteboard or paper in the place of linen about the Blessed

[1] Vide Pugin, *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament*, p. 86. sub. *Corporal.*

[2] The writer has heard of cases where, not merely cardboard made of rags, but even coarser kinds of board made of old newspapers, esparto grass, etc., and in some cases squares of zinc, have been used to stiffen the pall! The bottom is reached, when a piece of blotting paper is fastened with pins on to the underside of the pasteboard stiffened pall. This abomination, the writer has seen in use in English churches.

Sacrament is contrary to some of the oldest canons."[1]

II.

There should be but two linen cloths about the sacred elements when upon the altar, in addition to the linen cloths with which the altar is covered.

(1) The square corporas, which is opened out and spread upon the centre of the fair linen cloth which covers the altar, and upon which the holy vessels are placed and the elements are consecrated. This corporas is not explicitly named in the rubrics of the Prayer Book; but it was in use in the English Church in the second year of King Edward VI., and so is authorised by the Ornaments Rubric.

(2) The second corporas, folded to one-ninth its full size; at first, used folded to cover the chalice with,[2] and, later in the Service,

[1] *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 34.

[2] The corporasses (1) and (2) above named, are referred to by Durandus thus—Duplex enim est palla quæ dicitur corporale; una scilicet quam diaconus super altare extendit, altera quam super calicem plicatam imponit."—*Rationale Div. Off.* Lib. iv. cap. 29. The corporas (1), as was usual in the middle ages, was sufficiently ample to turn up and cover the chalice, thus also serving the purpose of corporas (2) named above. This long corporas was in use in Forgue, Aberdeenshire, as recently as the year 1900.

The symbolism of the folded corporas (2) is explained by Corsetti thus—"Plicatum vero, ut nec initium, nec finis appareat, quia significat linteamina, et sudarium præsertim

opened out and spread over what remains of the Sacrament, after the communion of the people. This second corporas is that referred to in the second rubric which follows the administration of the Consecrated Species: "When all have communicated, the minister shall return to the Lord's Table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the Consecrated Elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth."[1] The Carthusians, as we have already said, still use the old long corporas: the only covering for the chalice being provided by the hinder part of the corporas bent back over it.

The Dominican directions for the corporas and pall are as follows: "'*Corporalia*,' supra quæ semper consecrari et reponi debent SS. Corpus et Sanguis Domini, 'e tela linea, pura et candida sint, simplicia, nihil elaborata, nulla in parte rupta, et nihil serici intextum habeant, acus opere simplici, punctim solum retorta sint. Eadem non notabiliter parva aut magna erunt, sed convenientis mensuræ, ita ut latitudo sit, quæ quatuor plicas in longum, et tres in latum

capitis Christi, cum sit Deus, qui nec initium habet, nec finem." — *Praxis Sacrorum Rituum ac Cæremoniarum*, p. 427. Venice, 1739. Corsetti here follows Alcuin, *De Div. Offic.* Bibl. Patr. Auct. i. 282.

[1] The Scottish Liturgy of 1637 directs, that "when all have communicated, he that celebrates shall go to the Lord's Table, and cover with a fair linen cloth, or corporall, that which remaineth of the consecrated Elements."—Keeling, *Liturgiæ Britannicæ*, 2nd ed. pp. 218, 219. Lond. 1851.

non excedat.' . . . Parva *Palla* sit ad cooperiendum calicem, quæ (præter amplitudinem) ex eadem materia et eodem modo confecta sit ac ipsa corporalia."[1] "The *Corporasses* upon which the most holy Body and Blood of the Lord should always be consecrated and laid (kept), 'shall be of linen, pure and white, in nowise embroidered, not with frayed edges, with no silk interwoven therewith, but hemstitched with plain stitching. They shall not be conspicuously small or large, but of a convenient size, so that the breadth does not exceed four folds to the length and three to the width.' . . . There shall be a small *Pall* to cover the chalice, which (except as regards the size) shall be made in the same manner and of the same material as the corporasses themselves." Here we have the pasteboard stiffening of the pall definitely excluded by a modern Western authority. It will be observed, too, that the Dominican corporas, like the Cistercian and Benedictine, has four folds to the length and three to the breadth.[2]

[1] *Cæremoniale juxta ritum S. Ordinis Prædicatorium*, p. 141. §§ 505, 506. Mechlin, 1869.

[2] "Unicum quoque fuit olim corporale, nec aderat parva illa palla, qua nunc calicem operimus: cum enim palla corporalis latior esset, ea etiam utebantur ad tegendum calicem. Liber antiquorum Usuum Cisterciensium, c. 53., ait: *Diaconus posito offertorio super altare, ponat calicem super corporale in secundo plicatu anterioris et sinistræ dextræque partis et panem ante calicem, revolvens super eum corporale.* Vetus item Ceremoniale Congregationis Bursfeldensis ordinis S. Benedicti, cap. 44., ait, *Diaconus explicet*

Mr. Cuthbert Atchley, in his invaluable paper on "Certain Variations from the Rule concerning the Material of the Altar Linen," [1] speaks of the corporasses concisely thus,—"Upon the uppermost linen cloth at masstime is laid the larger of the pair of corporasses, the other being employed to cover the chalice." The two smaller corporasses, as we have seen [2] were kept folded, when not in use, in the burse or forel.[3] These are the only linen cloths authorized for use in the English Church during the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. No others are either necessary or desirable.

corporale habens tres plicatus in latum, et quatuor in longum, medium latitudinis ponens in medio altaris. Et infra, *Plicatu extremæ partis corporalis calicem operiat.* Manet hodie hic ritus apud Carthusianos."—Bona, *Rerum Liturgicarum*, lib. i. cap. xxv. § xi. col. 297. Opera Omnia, Antwerp, 1739.

[1] *St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans.* Vol. iv. p. 156.

[2] See p. 205, of this work.

[3] "*Forelle*, to keep in a book. Jocelyn de Brakelonda relates in his Chronicle, p. 84, that Abbot Samson examined the relics of St. Edmund in 1198, and when the shrine was closed up, '*positus est super loculum forulus quidam sericus, in quo deposita fuit scedula Anglice scripta, continens quasdam salutaciones Antwini Monachi.*' . . . *Foruli*, according to Papias, are, '*thece vel cistæ librorum, tabularum, vel aliarum rerum, ut spatæ ; dicte, quod de foris tegant.*' . . . Horman says, 'I hadde leuer haue my boke sowed in a forel than bounde in bourdis, and couerede, and clasped, and garnysshed with bolyens.' Jennings, in his Observations on the Dialects of the West, states, that the cover of a book is still termed a forrel."—*Promptorium Parvulorum*, p. 171, sub 'Forelle.' Camden Soc. The word 'forel' is applied to the burse, because it resembles the cover of a book, opening in the same manner.

It only remains to be said, that the small stiffened pall or corporas is disallowed in the English Church, which prescribes a fair white linen cloth in its place. This is prescribed not only by the Ornaments Rubric, but also by the rubric of the Communion Service, which explicitly enforces the canon law of the West on this subject.

The Biretta.

Appeal to modern foreign usages excluded by the Ornaments Rubric, pp. 229—231; disregard of the terms of the Rubric, and the mischief ensuing, pp. 231, 232. The Italian biretta not worn in England in the second year of Edward VI., pp. 232, 233. Reference to St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xi., p. 233. Mr. C. Browne's opinion, p. 234. Le Brun's opinion, p. 235. The amice as a head-covering, pp. 236, 237; its symbolic signification, p. 237. Dr. Rock on the amice, p. 238; De Moleon on the same, p. 239; and other testimony, pp. 239, 240. The Lincoln use of a cap, pp. 240, 241. The reason for a head-covering in church no longer valid, p. 241. The wearing of the Italian biretta unlawful in the English Church, p. 242; further testimony to this verdict, pp. 242—244. *Note* on the Dominican custom, p. 244.

XI.

THE BIRETTA.

WE may safely say, that there is no rubric in the Book of Common Prayer which is more comprehensive, or of greater importance, than that which is commonly known as the Ornaments Rubric. And we may say, too, that there is no rubric concerning the interpretation of which, during the last fifty years, there has been more discussion. The vexed question, broadly speaking, has regard to what is signified by the closing words of the rubric, "the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." It is not our intention, in this essay, to enter into this question, but to point out that, whatever ambiguity there may be as to the meaning of the words just quoted, there is one thing at least about the Ornaments Rubric which admits of no dispute—namely, that the rubric is so worded as to exclude implicitly any appeal to the usages of any foreign Church whatever, in regard to the ornaments either of the church or of the ministers. The ornaments of both church and ministers, authorised and prescribed by the rubric, are

such as were legalised "in this Church of England" in a certain year. Whatever ornaments were in use in the churches of the continent in that particular year, is, of course, a matter of interest from an antiquarian point of view, but nothing more; unless, in fact, it can be demonstrated that the English and the foreign ornaments were identical in the year to which we are referred. To set to work to prove any such identity is a waste of time, in interpreting the force of the Ornaments Rubric; for the reason that, when we have once satisfied ourselves as to what ornaments were used or worn in the English churches in the year in question, we have reached the goal: there is no need for further enquiry. As to whether the foreign ornaments of 1548-9 were similar to the English in that year, or not, does not seriously affect the question: it is, strictly speaking, quite outside any enquiry suggested by the Ornaments Rubric. Where any doubt exists, we may, with advantage, refer to the foreign customs in order to clear up difficulties; but beyond this, we cannot go.[1] In short, we repeat that

[1] In speaking upon this point, Mr. Micklethwaite observes, "We are referred to the usages of our own Church, and it is to documents concerning that Church that we must turn for information. It does not, however, follow that all study of foreign customs is useless. On the contrary, we should sometimes find it difficult to understand what is recorded of our own without it. But the help comes oftener from those local usages which the Roman policy has for

we are referred for our model and standard, as concerning the fittings and utensils of our churches and the vestures of the clergy, to the legalised usages which prevailed "in this Church of England in the second year of the reign of Edward VI.," and in no other Church, either in that year or in any other year.

And yet, obvious as this is to any one who takes words in their grammatical sense, we are obliged sorrowfully to confess, that the directions of the Ornaments Rubric in this particular have been considerably disregarded. Ornaments have been freely introduced into certain English churches of which it is quite impossible to say, 'This thing was in use in the English Church in the second year of Edward the Sixth.' In fact, the persons who have introduced the foreign ornaments in question never seemed to have asked, 'Is this thing one of the ornaments which were used in England in the year 1548–1549?' Had they done so, we should have been saved from much of the confusion in matters of ceremonial from which we are suffering, and which is so perplexing to the laity. We appeal confidently to the Ornaments Rubric in defending the adoption of the Eucharistic Vestments, or the two Altar Lights. We cannot appeal to this same rubric in defence of

centuries been trying to destroy, than from the common form which it tries to enforce."—*The Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 15. Alcuin Club Tracts, i.

certain other things, for the simple reason that they were not "in this Church of England . . . in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." And the special mischief of the proceeding which we are condemning is, that the unauthorised foreign ornaments and usages have come to be regarded by a large number of people as Catholic, whilst in reality, from a scientific and historical point of view, they are not. For us, also, in the English Church they lack ecclesiastical authority. We have to be very thankful that these foreign ornaments, and varities of ornaments, are nearly all degraded forms, and often in the worst of taste. They were not "in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI.," and they have not since been sanctioned. The ground of objection is not, of course, that an ornament is foreign; but simply and solely that it is not authorised.

Of certain unauthorised ornaments we have already spoken in previous articles of this work. Of another, we are now about to speak, namely, the Italian biretta. Happily, no one has ever yet had the rashness to assert that the Italian biretta was worn by the clergy "in this Church of England" in the year named in the Ornaments Rubric. And yet, incredible as it appears to reasonable men, this thing has been adopted by not a few of the English clergy, in blind, unreasoning

imitation of the custom of the Roman Church.[1] The use of the Italian biretta by an English clergyman is about as great an act of private judgment or sentiment, as opposed to ecclesiastical authority, in a matter of ceremonial, as it is possible to conceive.

I.

The subject of the head-coverings of the clergy is one beset with no ordinary difficulty. It is a subject so vast and complicated, that a full discussion of it would occupy a treatise to itself. But the enquiry is narrowed considerably, when we confine our attention to the special subject of this article, namely, the Italian biretta. Whilst there is evidence that the old square cap was in constant use in England in 1548–9, there is no evidence that has yet been produced that the English clergy wore the modern Italian biretta either in church or out of church during the reign of Edward VI. And; until such evidence is produced, the thing is disallowed by the terms of the Ornaments Rubric, and the Canons of the English Church.

St. Paul, in i. Cor. xi., lays down, that "a man indeed ought not to cover his head, foras-

1 "Sacerdos omnibus paramentis indutus . . . capite cooperto accedit ad altare. . . . Cum pervenerit ad altare . . . caput detegit, biretum ministro porrigit." At the end of mass, "Sacerdos accipit biretum a ministro, caput cooperit, ac . . . redit ad sacristiam."—*Missale Romanum*, Ritus celebrandi Missam, ii. 1, 2; xii. 6.

much as he is the image and glory of God;" and that "every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head." He declares that "the head" which is thus dishonoured is Christ,—"the head of every man is Christ."[1] It is doubtless in accordance with this explicit direction, that all Catholic Christian communities have insisted upon the head being uncovered during the time of divine service.[2] Mr. Charles Browne, in his able article on Ecclesiastical Head-dress,[3] says, "Those who have closely investigated the subject declare, that there is no clear or conclusive evidence of there having been any distinctive head-dress appropriated to the superior orders of the clergy during, at least, the first thousand years of the Christian era." In allusion to the bishop's mitre, which we believe to be a lawful ornament in the English Church, the same writer says,[4] "against the antiquity of the mitre there is the very strong negative evidence that (as it is said), there is not a single Pontifical or ceremonial work of any sort earlier than the eleventh century, that contains any direction to invest the bishop at

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 3, 4, 7.

[2] The only exception to this rule is that of the Armenians, according to whose ceremonial, the celebrant covers his head, during the canon of the mass, with two veils of white silk or linen, over which, in later times, a bishop wears a cap ornamented with gold and jewels.—See Browne, *Ecclesiastical Head-dress*, St. Pauls' Eccles. Soc. Trans. Vol. iii. p. 156.

[3] Ibid. p. 157.

[4] Ibid. p. 158.

his consecration with any special head-dress, or any indication that he was to wear any such ornament at any ceremony or function. And, indeed, in a special account of the ceremonial used at High Mass on Easter Day, in the year 986, although all the episcopal ornaments worn are set out and described in much detail, there is nothing said about a mitre." Pierre Le Brun, in commenting on the directions of the Roman Missal,[1] says, "*Le prêtre marche la tête couverte.* Il y a sept ou huit cens ans qu'on étoit toujours découvert en allant à l'autel. Cet usage s'est conservé en plusieurs Eglises, à Treves, à Toul, Metz, Verdun, Sens, Laon, Tournai; le célébrant et les ministres vont a l'autel la tête nue."[2] "Seven or eight hundred years ago (Le Brun wrote in the first half of the eighteenth century), it was the rule to proceed to the altar uncovered. This custom is preserved in several Churches, at Treves, at Toulouse, Metz, Verdun, Sens, Laon, Tournai; the celebrant and the ministers proceed to the altar bareheaded." The biretta, or old cap, is first mentioned in the middle of the thirteenth century.[3]

[1] See footnote p. 233.

[2] *Explication de la Messe*, Vol. i. Art. viii. p. 95. Liege, 1777.

[3] "Birreta tamen primum seculo decimo-tertio commemorantur."—Kozma de Papi, *Liturgica Sacra Catholica*, p. 52. Ratisbon 1863.

II.

The Ornaments Rubric authorises the use of an amice as one of the Eucharistic vestments. The amice was originally the priest's head-covering at Mass, and there is a considerable amount of good evidence that it was so used in the middle ages. John Beleth, writing at the close of the twelfth century, has, "Amictu pro galea caput contegit."[1] "(The priest) covers his head with the amice for a helmet." Pierre le Brun,[2] speaking of the use of the amice, says, "A Rome et dans la plupart des Eglises, vers l'an 900, on le regarda (l'amict) comme un casque qu'on mit sur la tête pour l'y laisser jusqu'à ce qu'on fût entiérment habillé; et l'abattre autour du cou avant que de commencer la Messe. Cet usage s'observe encore à Narbonne, à Auxerre depuis la Toussaint jusqu'à à Pâques, et chez les Dominicains et les Capuchins." "At Rome and in the greater number of Churches, about the year 900, the amice was regarded as a helmet, which was put on the head and left there until the priest was completely vested; and was allowed to fall round the neck before commencing the Mass. This usage is observed still at Narbonne, at Auxerre from All Saints until Easter, and also by the Dominicans[3] and Capuchins."

[1] *Rationale Div. Off.* cap. xxxii.

[2] *Explication de la Messe*, Vol. i. Art. iv. p. 43.

[3] For the present-day Dominican custom, see Note at the conclusion of this essay.

The prayer appointed in the Roman Missal, when the priest puts on the amice, points to the original use of that vesture as a head-covering, "Impone, Domine, capiti meo galeam salutis. . . ."[1] "Put, O Lord, the helmet of salvation on my head. . . ." Durandus, writing at the close of the thirteenth century, also describes the amice as a head-covering: "Sacerdos assumit amictum quo caput tegitur," giving the symbolic meaning, "de hoc apostolus ad Eph. vi., *Galeam salutis assumite*."[2] "The priest puts on the amice with which his head is covered; concerning which, the apostle in Ephes. vi., says, *Put ye on the helmet of salvation*."

In the year 1543, in the reign of Henry VIII., the rites and ceremonies of the Church were brought under review, and a *Rationale* was issued to explain their meaning.[3] In regard to the amice, we read, "First, he putteth on the amice, which, as touching the mystery, signifies the veil, with which the Jews covered the face of Christ, when they buffeted Him in the time of His passion: and, as touching the minister, it signifies faith, which is the head, ground, and foundation of all virtues; and therefore he puts that upon

[1] This prayer is given in Burchardt's *Ordo Missæ* of 1502. See Cochleus, *Speculum Missæ*, p. 198.

[2] *Rationale*, lib. iii. cap. 2. de Amictu.

[3] See Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. ii. part ii. book iii. fol. 191. Lond. 1714.

his head first."[1] It will be observed that within a very few years of the second year of Edward VI., the amice is described in the *Rationale* of 1543, as a covering for the head. It would, almost certainly, thus be regarded in 1548–1549.

Upon this subject, Dr. Rock says, "Early in the thirteenth century, we know it was a rite, already well established abroad, to keep the amice hanging over the head while the vestments were being put on;[2] and so widely did this usage spread itself, that, from such a practice, mystical writers and the Church herself began to look upon the amice as symbolising the helmet of salvation, a meaning which is yet given to it in the prayer that we still say at putting it on, the while we let it rest for an instant on the head. . . . According to the customs of the old religious orders, the amice, to this day, is always worn over the head in going to, and coming from the altar, at the beginning and the end of service."[3] As we have just said, the Dominicans and the Capuchins still keep up this custom of using

[1] Collier, *Eccles. Hist.* Vol. ii. part ii. book iii. fol. 194. The first of the above meanings is that given by Durandus, *Rationale*, lib. iii. cap. 2. "Amictus etiam representat operimentum, quo Judei velabant faciem Christi, dicentes Matthei. xxvi., *Prophetiza nobis Christe, quis est qui te percussit.*"

[2] Quidam amictu caput suum obnubit, donec super os casulæ illum revolvat et velut caput aut coronam illi coaptet."—Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De Div. Offic.* cap. xix.

[3] *The Church of our Fathers*, Vol. i. pp. 477, 478.

the amice, and not the biretta, as a head-covering in church.[1] De Moleon, in describing the usages of the cathedral of Angers in the year 1757, says, "Le célébrant et ces deux-ci se servent d'amicts et d'aubes parées, et ont en tout tems l'amict sur la tête, qu'ils n'abaissent que depuis le *Sanctus* jusqu'à la Communion."[2] "The celebrant and these two (the deacon and sub-deacon) use amices and albs with apparels, and have always the amice on the head, which they only lower from the *Sanctus* to the Communion."

In *Dives and Pauper*, an interesting work on the Ten Commandments, which was written at the close of the fourteenth century, Dives asks, "What betokeneth the clothinge of the prieste at masse?" to which Pauper replies: "The amyt on his heed at the begynnynge, betokeneth that clothe that Christis face was hyled with in tyme of his passion, when the Jewes hyled his face and bobbed hym and made hym arede who that smote hym."[3] Watson, bishop of Lincoln, in the sixteenth century, says, "For as the Jewes did first cover Christes face, and did mocke him and buffet him, so hathe the priest in memory of that, an amisse

[1] "Amictus capiti operto caputio imponitur."—*Cæremoniale juxta Ritum Sac. Ordin. Prædic.* § 538, p. 150. Mechlin, 1869.

[2] *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 87.

[3] qu. Rock, *The Church of our Fathers*, Vol. i. p. 480, n.

put upon his head."[1] Hence it is that, in some of our late documents, the amice is called the head-cloth, e.g., "for washing eleven aubes and as many head-clothes."[2] In Lydgate's *Vertue of the Masse*, we find,

"Upon his hede, an Amyte, the prist hathe."[3]

Thomas Becon, writing in Queen Mary's reign, says, "Ye first put on upon your head an head-piece, called an amice, to keep your brains in temper, as I think."[4] In the *Workes of Sir Thomas More, Knyght*,[5] we read, "He would have the peple pull the priest from the aulter and y^e^ amis from his head."

III.

From the foregoing, we have good evidence that the amice, and not the biretta, was the customary head-covering at Mass in Old England, though at Lincoln, however, the priest wore a cap on approaching the altar.[6]

[1] *Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne*, fol. lxxi. A.D. 1558. qu. Rock, Vol. i. p. 481, n.

[2] Fuller, *History of Waltham Abbey*, p. 273. Lond. 1840. qu. Rock, Ibid.

[3] See *The Lay Folks Mass Book*, p. 167.

[4] *The Displaying of the Popish Mass*, Works, iii. p. 259. Parker Soc.

[5] London, 1557, p. 641. col. ii. F.

[6] The celebrant himself now passed his cap (it is not called a biretta, but *pillius*, or *pileus*) to the charge of a boy who expected 1½d. for taking care of it till the service was done."—Wordsworth, *Notes on Medieval Services*, p. 29. "Et dum canitur *Gloria in excelsis* et cetera deponat qui preest officio pillium et tradatur cuidam puero ministranti in

It is just possible that further research into the subject of the choir dress may show that the cap used at Lincoln, on approaching the altar, was a medieval English form of the biretta. The cap, or *a* cap, used in church by the medieval clergy was certainly called a biretta. But the evidence at present forthcoming points out, that this Lincoln use of the cap held the same position as regards English practice, as the Lincoln crossing at the end of the Nicene Creed, to which we have previously referred: that is to say, it was a marked exception to the general rule.

There is another point about the use of the cap or biretta, which should not be forgotten: Unlike the mitre, it was used simply as a protection from the cold in unwarmed churches. The reason for its use—and indeed for the use of the amice as a head-covering in church—is quite gone. These head-coverings have long been disused in England, as the need of their use ceased. Our churches in winter are now warmed. Not so in the Roman Church, however. Like the chalice-bag, which seems to have been turned into the chalice-veil, the cap, once worn to protect the head from cold, has developed into a thing of different shape, and

altari: et pro custodia illius pillij recipiet vinum scilicet j. d. ō: *hoc est* j. denarium et obolum, ad potandum."—*Lincoln Cathedral Statutes*, Bradshaw and Wordsworth, part i, The Black Book, p. 377. The carrying of the 'mortar-board' by the clergy in English cathedrals appears to be a survival of this Lincoln custom.

its use has been regulated as a mere piece of ceremonial. The use of the Italian biretta, as certain English clergy have introduced it, is not only the use of an illegal kind of ornament, but it is an illegal use also—the introduction of a ceremony of modern Roman growth. Canon 18 of 1604 directs, that "no man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of divine service, except he have some infirmity; in which case let him wear a night-cap or coif."[1] The wearing of the Italian biretta in church is thus implicitly forbidden by the English Church.

"It would seem," says Dr. Eager,[2] "as if many among our clergy thought that there was something ancient, venerable, and perhaps even mystical, if not lovely, connected with that most hideous and mishapen head-covering which they have taken of late to wear, the Italian biretta! It seems probable that that extraordinarily shaped and stiffened head-dress can hardly claim even so great an antiquity as two hundred and fifty years. This particular shape I believe has been entirely confined to the use of a large part of the clergy of the papal obedience, with the exception of Spain

[1] Cardwell, *Synodalia*. i. 255, In the Latin version, *pileolo aut rica*.—Ibid. 172. The night-cap, or coif, appears to have been a flat broad cap.

[2] *Notes on Customs in Spanish Churches, illustrative of Old English Ceremonial*, St. Paul's Eccles. Soc. Trans. Vol. iv. p. 116.

(even the Portugese form, being hardly so ugly), until with great want of judgment it was introduced into this country by some priests of the Catholic school, who no doubt had seen it used in their travels, or worn by some of the Italian Mission in England. It was done no doubt with the best of intention, believing this to be the ancient form of head-covering for a priest; and so they forthwith took to wearing it, discarding the more venerable and national 'mortar-board.' I have examined all the pictures, engravings or monuments to which I have had access, in which this cap has been shewn, and Raphael, Holbein and many others have often drawn priests with this cap; but in no picture or sculpture which I have examined of the sixteenth and early seventeenth century have I seen a priest's cap depicted in this stiffened Italian shape." In speaking of the biretta as two-hundred and fifty years old, Dr. Eager means what the word "biretta" signifies to us now; namely, the modern Italian development of this head-covering, stiffened, with its three peaks.

Mr. Micklethwaite says, "The priest's cap has its modern representative in the square college cap, which is directly derived from it by a gradual process of stiffening. The *biretta* is a foreign degradation of the same sort, and I can not understand why, when we have our own tradition, we should go out of our way to adopt a foreign one. If the modern English

form is thought not suitable for use in church, the change should be to that in use at the date to which the Ornaments Rubric refers us. The cap was used in processions and in quire, but not at the altar." [1]

[1] *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, p. 59. Alcuin Club Tracts i.

NOTE. The Dominican custom as regards the amice as a head-covering is as follows:

§ ii. *Quomodo Sacerdos se præparare debeat ad Missam.*

"Deinde accipiens Amictum circa extremitates, et cordulas, crucem in medio signando, eum osculetur (ubi facta est crux), et, capite imponens, dicat: *Impone, Domine, capite meo galeam salutis, ad expugnandos omnes diabolicos incursus. Amen.* Illo caputium circumtegat. . . ."

"Ad Missale, super cussino ad cornu Epistolæ se conferat, aperiat et reperiat Missam; quo facto, revertatur junctis ante pectus manibus, ad medium altaris, et ibi ambabus manibus caput discooperiat. . . ."

§ vii. *A communione usque ad finem Missæ.*

"Cum ad finem Evangelii perventum est. . . . Deinde caput cruci devotius inclinet, et cooperto ambabus manibus capite caputio et amictu. . . ."

§ ii. *Ab initio Missæ usque ad Evangelium* (In Missa majori).

In incæptione Missæ . . . sacerdos procedat ad altare, cooperto capite caputio et amictu. . . ."—*Cæremoniale juxta ritum S. Ordinis Prædicatorum*, §§ 1206, 1218, 1272, 1277. Mechlin, 1869.

From the above directions it will be seen that the Dominicans cover the head with the amice and hood, on going to and on returning from the altar.

"Omnes in ingressu chori, et egressu, versa facie ad Altare, nudo capite Æstate; Hyeme vero, in Ecclesia Metropolitana et in Ecclesiis Collegiatis, demissa Cappa lanea, profunde ante Altare se inclinabunt. Si Sanctissimum Sacramentum publicae fidelium venerationi sit expositum, omnes genuflectent nudo omnino capite, etiam Hyeme."—*Ceremoniale Parisiense*, Pt. i. c. ii. § 3. 1703.

OXFORD:
PRINTED BY A. R. MOWBRAY AND CO.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

The Ceremonial of the English Church.

Second Edition. 275 pages. Price: cloth, 2/- net.
Cheaper edition, cloth, 1/6 net; paper, 1/- net.

CONTENTS.

PART I. THE MORAL PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS CEREMONIAL.

Introduction: The Object of Ceremonial: The Relation of Ceremonial to Doctrine: The Relation of Ceremonial to Devotion and Conduct.

PART II. THE REGULATION OF ENGLISH CEREMONIAL.

The Principles of English Ceremonial: Modification of the Ancient Usages: The Ornaments Rubric: The Canons of the English Church.

PART III. ORNAMENTS AND CEREMONIES OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

Ornaments of the Church: Ornaments of the Minister: Ceremonies of the Church.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Fair and impartial . . . while a high standard is advocated, the general tone is sober. The book may be commended to all worshippers, both clerical and lay, as a very useful one, indicating as it does the authorities and arguments for the various ornaments and ceremonies which are adopted by so many true Churchmen. Those who are attached to simpler forms may gain much information, which should give them a truer view of some things to which they are opposed."—*The Guardian.*

"We require in writers on ceremonial the observance of caution. Mr. Vernon Staley conforms to that requirement. He affirms positively nothing which has not been firmly established by research; will have nothing to do with fancy ceremonies; holds fast to the English way of doing things; is thoroughly loyal to the Prayer Book. It is a merit of the book that it could be read with advantage by lay folk, not specially interested in the *minutiæ* of ceremonial. What we like about Mr. Staley's Book is its adherence to the old ways of the *Ecclesia Anglicana.*"—*The Church Times.*

"The volume is interesting and valuable."—*Church Bells.*

"We do most heartily recommend it to all who desire to see the true arguments for ceremonial observances, and their comparative antiquity stated in a clear and impartial manner."—*The Churchwoman.*

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO., OXFORD & LONDON.

KU-996-156